

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A295

The Vietnam Decision**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its lead editorial Friday morning, makes several pertinent points regarding the decisions now facing the administration in light of the apparent lack of a response from Hanoi to our peace offensive.

The Times emphasizes that "many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is that fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year."

The decisive new element, the Times points out, is the ninefold increase in American troops in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile—

The newspaper observes—

It has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table.

Warning against further escalation of the war, the Times warns:

A further large-scale buildup would not end the military statement in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration, and additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia, and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

Apparently alluding to a letter from Gen. James M. Gavin, appearing in the latest Harper's magazine and to which I alluded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1966, the Times concludes as follows:

At the present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the New York Times lead editorial of Friday, January 20:

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Failure of the Johnson peace offensive thus far to bring about formal negotiations with Hanoi inescapably raises the question: what course should the United States now follow?

Much depends on Washington's evaluation of Hanoi's ambiguous public and private replies and on the official estimate of how long it is safe to keep the bombers grounded. Is Hanoi holding out for concessions? Or is Hanoi seeking to avoid a conference out of the conviction that the United States will get tired and withdraw? President Johnson expressed the latter belief yesterday. But his conclusion from this remains unclear, since he also said: "The door of peace must be kept wide open."

Many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese Army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is the fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year.

The decisive new element has been the ninefold buildup of American troops in South Vietnam to a strength of about 190,000. South Vietnamese armed forces, including militia and police, now exceed 635,000. With South Korean, New Zealand, and Australian units, there are upward of 850,000 men in the field. And the backing of American air and naval strength gives these forces devastating firepower and unparalleled mobility.

This buildup, in the words of President Johnson's state of the Union message, has put the enemy on notice that "time is no longer on his side" and that a Vietcong victory now is "out of reach."

Meanwhile, it has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table. The bombing did force North Vietnam to turn from Peiping to Moscow for antiaircraft missiles and, even more important, for massive economic and technical aid. But this unexpected dividend argues for a continued suspension of the bombing, rather than for its resumption.

As White House Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy recently observed: "It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement." And Moscow has also made it clear that peace efforts cannot be carried on while North Vietnam is being bombed.

The critical decision that confronts President Johnson, therefore, is not whether to resume the early bombing of the north—which even Republican leaders no longer press—but how to conduct the war in the south while continuing the probes for peace. The ground and air war in South Vietnam undoubtedly will resume fully after the lunar new year truce. What the President now must decide is whether to escalate that war in the south to a wholly new level by yielding to military requests for a doubling of American forces. Such a move would finally convert the struggle from a Vietnamese conflict into an American war against Asians.

A further large-scale buildup would not end the military stalemate in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration of additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia, and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

At present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice, not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

The Late Honorable John Taber**SPEECH**

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber was a most valuable Member

of this body. He served with great distinction for nearly 40 years. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, once as chairman, he became known as the watchdog of the Treasury. In that capacity he was instrumental in saving American taxpayers untold billions of dollars. It is doubtful if any one Member has ever done more in that respect.

John Taber was indeed a great American. He was devoted to the cause of good government, of sensible restraint in the function of the Central Government, and of those fundamentals which make the competitive free enterprise succeed. During his long period of distinguished service Mr. Taber did more than his share in the preservation of our institutions. We need more men of his dedication if our Republic is to be preserved.

An Intern's Views on Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have had numerous occasions to utilize the fine services of summer interns and are particularly grateful for the enthusiasms and interest they bring to their responsibilities.

Last summer I was pleased to have the services of Dan Spangler of Cody, Wyo., as a summer intern in my office. Dan, the son of Judge and Mrs. J. O. Spangler of Cody graduated in 1964 from the University of Wyoming with a degree in political science. He was attending Stanford University when he was selected as an intern for the Wyoming congressional office.

After a most satisfactory summer of employment Dan enrolled at the University of London under a Rotary International scholarship. His exposure there to students from many countries has broadened his outlook on American foreign policy. At a time when the sentiments of some college students have created apprehension in the minds of many Americans, I am happy to note his thoughtful and responsible approach to this serious matter. I respectfully recommend his essay on Vietnam to the consideration of my colleagues as a worthy example of the mature outlook youth can offer when stimulated to take an active interest in the affairs of government. His essays follows:

VIETNAM

The greatest problem of our time is how to achieve world peace. A world war could destroy civilization as we know it. Nuclear weapons have enabled the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to achieve a state of mutual deterrence. The threat to peace does not come from any direct conflict between these two states but from the possibility that they will become involved in what would begin as a limited war, then expand into a regional war until the interests of these two powers were directly involved, leaving no other alternative but a world conflagration. The existence of

large numbers of new, unstable states creates a number of opportunities for limited wars to expand into regional and world wars. In this situation, it is essential that the United States maintain flexible policies so that an escalated war will not be the only alternative. Before the present war widens any further, it is essential that the U.S. Congress conduct a public debate to explore fully the alternatives to a wider war and to insure that U.S. policy in southeast Asia expresses the will of the American people.

Historically, the area now known as North Vietnam has been the smallest but most densely populated sector of Indochina. North Vietnam was once controlled by China but in 939 A.D. its people revolted and established their own kingdom. Due to population pressures and poor agricultural land, after 1069 the North Vietnamese advanced steadily into neighboring lands of the south and west, overrunning large portions of what is now South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. This expansion continued for 800 years until it was halted by the imposition of French colonialism. After the Japanese invaded the area during World War II, French authority was never reestablished in the north and the northern drive to the south and west began once more. The French attempted to arrest this drive until their defeat at Dienbienphu in 1954. The Geneva Agreement of that year, which was never signed by the United States, called for a united Vietnam within 1 year. The agreement was never carried out, mainly because it was unrealistic and dangerous.

THE DIFFERENT FACTIONS

It is unrealistic to attempt to unify areas which offer as many contrasts as North and South Vietnam. Life in North Vietnam is still greatly influenced by Chinese ways due to China's former domination of the north and to the close proximity of the north to China. Geographically, North Vietnam is more closely linked with China than with South Vietnam. The north has adopted China's subtropical agricultural methods while the tropical south has a different way of life. There has long been a rivalry between Hanoi, a former Chinese capital and a cultural and administrative center, on one hand, and Saigon, a French-created port, commercial, and agricultural marketing city on the other. Communications have never been good between the two areas.

During World War II, Hanoi took its orders from the Vichy regime while Saigon was the center for the Gaullists. In opposition to French colonial rule, nationalist leaders in the north identified with the Kuomintang in China while the Cao Dai and Hoa Hoa factions led the nationalists in the south. With these profound differences in the development of North and South Vietnam, it is unrealistic to suppose that they could form a viable state.

THE AREA

The unification of Vietnam under the aggressive Communist regime of the north would be dangerous for the neighboring states as well, which have not forgotten the earlier period of Vietnamese invasion and domination. For, with the seizure of the rich rice lands in South Vietnam, the well-trained and equipped northern army would easily have Laos and Cambodia at its mercy. Laos is the largest, least populated country in Indochina, and it has the least capacity to defend itself. The country is deeply divided ethnically and politically. Cambodia is also sparsely populated and is in a vulnerable strategic position.

Ships using the Cambodian capital, Phnom Penh, on the Mekong River, have to pass through South Vietnam. The Mekong Delta is open to attack from coastal and interior routes which can be commanded from North Vietnam and Laos. Thus, it is essential to the security of Cambodia that South Vietnam and Laos are in friendly hands. To the

west of Laos lies Thailand. The bulk of the Lao people live in Thailand, which has much reason to fear a Vietnamese-Laos combination. In addition, from 50,000 to 80,000 pro-Communist refugees from Vietnam have settled in northeast Thailand since World War II.

The instability and remoteness of northeastern Thailand make it imperative that the northeastern border is occupied by a stable Laos. These compounded problems of national security would be the consequences of a Vietnam united under a Communist regime. The expansionist tendencies of a Communist-controlled Vietnam would engulf the entire Indochinese Peninsula in large-scale warfare. As the war would expand, China would become more anxious to protect its borders and would play a larger part in the struggle. Eventually, the vital interests of such powers as India, Indonesia, and the Soviet Union might become directly involved.

The security of Australia and New Zealand, both close American allies, depends upon a stable situation in southeast Asia, as World War II demonstrated. Britain is pledged to the defense of Malaysia and could become drawn into a wider struggle. If the eventually victorious powers in southeast Asia maintained close relations with China or fell under Chinese domination, the United States could be subject to a grave threat.

THE CHINA ROLE

It is difficult to tell if the Chinese always mean what they say but the Chinese leaders have pledged themselves to the destruction of the United States. In light of these pronouncements, the United States must keep a close watch on China, which is now a nuclear power. In the coming years, it may be expected that China will achieve the capacity to deliver its nuclear weapons around the world.

From our experience with the Soviet Union, it is clear that the best way to meet a nuclear threat is with another nuclear threat. But, if southern Asia were in the control of hostile powers, the United States would face great problems in mounting a credible deterrent to a Chinese nuclear force. Present-day missiles fired from the continental United States, can reach China only by crossing Soviet territory. This only increases the danger that the Soviet Union would align with China in a war against the United States. Although relations are tense between Russia and China, the Soviet Union has given no indication that it would prefer a non-Communist Chinese regime.

BALANCE OF POWER

Thus, the U.S. presence in Vietnam can be seen as an effort at limiting the scope of armed conflict in southern Asia, to insure that the great powers are not drawn into an open conflict in a wider war. Such a wider war would be certain to result if the United States did not provide a balance to the forces of North Vietnam. A balance of power strategy is utilized to guarantee that no one power has enough strength to subdue the other states. Without the balance provided by the United States, and with North Vietnamese possession of the rich rice lands of South Vietnam, the balance in southeast Asia would be torn asunder.

This would happen because the states of southeast Asia are so weak internally. But if the policies of the United States are successful, these countries will someday be able to stand on their own feet. Before this happens, great changes must take place for the area is woefully underdeveloped and many of the people lack any sense of national identity and loyalty. These changes may come about in one of two ways—violently or peacefully. The Communists advocate violent change while the United States has always realized that peaceful change, through foreign aid and technical assistance, is in its best interests.

POVERTY THE REAL EVIL

Any successful foreign policy must be defined in terms of national interests and backed with adequate power. An American policy aimed at preserving the territorial integrity of Asian states while assisting in their economic and social development is in the American interest. The question that the American people and the U.S. Congress must now answer is whether or not that policy is backed by adequate power.

There is no doubt that the United States is able to apply enough military power to prevent an overt Communist takeover. But this tactic, by itself, will never bring stability to the region. American foreign policy in southeast Asia must receive more support from another form of power, which is the ability of the United States to encourage social and economic development. Stability can be achieved only if progress is made in this area, for poverty is a necessary prerequisite for the success of Communist revolutionary guerrilla warfare.

Every successful Communist revolution, whether in Russia, China, Cuba, or Indochina, has been based upon impoverished masses. The Vietcong would have collapsed long ago without support from the people in the countryside. It is futile for the United States to remain in South Vietnam unless a massive effort is made to unite the South Vietnamese people behind their government. This task cannot wait until the war is over because the war will never end until social and economic changes are made.

Besides intensifying our efforts in present developmental programs, we should give renewed thought to the development of the Mekong River, which affects the livelihood of the entire Indochinese peninsula. The political fragmentation and strategic weaknesses of northeast Thailand, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and Laos are due partly to obstacles which make the Mekong difficult to navigate. By helping the southeast Asian nations to harness and develop this vital waterway, the United States could score a great victory in the battle for peaceful change by stimulating the imagination and loyalties of people in the most troubled parts of the region and by providing the opportunity for a better life to millions of Asians.

CAUTION

In defending our national interests, we must proceed with restraint and must view the scene from the vantage point of other nations, as well as our own. We must not allow ourselves to be placed in a position in which we no longer have any reasonable alternatives. As regard our policies in southeast Asia, the words of Bolingbroke are particularly relevant:

"Victories, that bring honor to the arms, may bring shame to the councils, of a nation. To win a battle, to take a town, is the glory of a general, and of an army. * * * But the glory of a nation is to proportion the ends she proposes, to her interests and her strength; the means she employs, to the ends she proposes; and the vigor she exerts, to both."

This is a time when momentous decisions must be made concerning future American policies in southeast Asia. The decisions we make can be of vital importance to the future of mankind. Therefore, in this session of congressional debate, let all opinions be voiced, let all factors be considered, and let us coldly calculate the effects of our past, present, and future actions. And finally, let us remember the judgment of our posterity with the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A297

Man Will Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused on the Far East today.

For it is there that the question most sharply asked is: "Will men be free or will men be slaves?"

And the answer from courageous men is that man will live as a free individual.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN—my distinguished colleague from South Carolina and a great American—underscored those points in a stirring speech January 23 at Taipei, Republic of China.

His remarks are an inspiration to those who cherish freedom, a ray of hope to the nameless faces enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. His message was clear and should give pause for thought to those misguided despots laboring under the delusion that America is soft, or will fail her commitments in the Far East.

His speech is of such import that I commend it for reading by the Members of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his message for the information of this body:

MEN WILL BE FREE

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN of South Carolina at the 12th annual Freedom Day Rally Taipei, the Republic of China, January 23)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you the greetings and the admiration of the Congress of the United States and the American people. As a member of the advisory board of the National Captive Nations' Committee and on behalf of that committee I bring to you the best wishes of captive peoples all over the world. You, of the Republic of China, have won the enduring admiration of free peoples everywhere by your valiant and successful struggle to maintain the freedom of this island. You are the hope of freedom throughout the mainland. Your past is an inspiring saga of man's indomitable will to be free. Your present is a source of pride and hope to all who hate tyranny. Your future is nothing less than a promise to history.

We gather here today to commemorate the courage of the 22,000 freedom fighters who defied tyranny and chose freedom instead. We gather here today to commemorate those throughout the world who have similarly struggled to escape terrorism and torture, those who continue the struggle for freedom. We commemorate and pay homage to the millions who have died to preserve freedom.

It is fitting and proper that we observe Freedom Day. May we be encouraged and inspired to go forth from this spot as the spark of a great crusade to free the world of enslavement and oppression. The valor of these 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners will remain forever an inspiration to those who cherish freedom.

The eyes of the world are today focused on the Far East. For, as Abraham Lincoln

said with reference to my own country, the world cannot continue half slave and half free. And it is here, in the Far East that the question is today being most sharply asked—will men be free or be slaves? It is here that the answer is being most plainly given. Men will be free.

It will not be easy—and there is no reason to think that it will be quick—for freedom faces a massive challenge in Asia, a challenge led by those as determined as they are evil. There will be disappointments, frustrations, and setbacks in the future as there have been in the past. But men will be free.

They will be free because the determination on the side of freedom is inexhaustible—and you are the proof of that. They will be free because the resources of the side of freedom are more than sufficient and the will to use those resources is as firm as rock.

Let no one be in any doubt about the commitment of the United States to the cause of freedom in Asia. The propaganda from Hanoi and Peking expresses the constant hope that the determination of the United States will weaken, that the effort of the United States will falter. They are engaging in a dangerous delusion if they believe their own propaganda. They are making the fatal mistake of tyrants when they misinterpret a freeman's love of peace. Love of peace does not mean that we will meekly submit to tyranny. Love of peace does not mean that we will purchase it at the cost of freedom—ours or anyone else's. As President Johnson said earlier this month in his state of the Union message, "We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

The Far East is the key area of the world geographically, economically, and politically. If totalitarianism should conquer the Far East, then all of Asia would fall. With Asia in Communist hands, Africa would be conquered. Western Europe would be outflanked and the forces of freedom would be in grave peril.

In Asia there are vast untapped resources of manpower, rubber, tin, oil, and uranium. These resources, under the control of Communist aggressors, would be used for conquest and war. These resources, under Communist control, would not be used for peace or enlightenment, for improved health and education. Under Communist control these vast resources would not be used for the advancement of freedom. They would be used for war and enslavement.

May I remind you that the Communist aggressors consider the individual as mere grains of sand on the seashore to be used by the masters of tyranny for their own selfish aggrandizement. We believe man is created in the image of an all-powerful being. We believe that man has individual rights and aspirations, that he is entitled to dignity and individual liberty. This we believe. This we will defend.

Lenin is reported as having said the road to Paris is the road through Peking. The Communists are ruthlessly liquidating the opposition and are proceeding on that road to Paris by way of southeast Asia, the Near East and northern Africa. To halt this blueprint for tyrannical power, conquest, and enslavement, the United States is spending blood and wealth in South Vietnam. The United States manifested its devotion to the cause of freedom by expending the flower of its young manhood to defend that cause in Korea.

Our Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is very wisely supporting with strength the freedom fighters in South Vietnam. President Johnson will not preside over the liquidation of freedom in Asia. He will instead preside over the restoration of freedom in Asia. He is a determined leader in the tradition of the Founding

Fathers of my country. By his courageous action, President Johnson has encouraged people throughout the world who are devoted and dedicated to the cause of freedom.

We support you, here in the Republic of China, with our wealth and with our armed might. Your struggle for freedom is ours. We will not withdraw and leave you to fight this battle alone. We are here to stay until freedom is secure in Asia and the aggressor collapses in his own evil structure.

In the history of the struggle for freedom you have produced one of the giant figures of our time. General Chiang Kai-shek was among the first to understand the diabolical tactics and sinister designs of the Communist world conspiracy. He began his heroic struggle to oppose communism on the mainland in the 1920's, and he has been a world-renowned champion in that struggle from that time to this. He and Madame Chiang long ago won the hearts of the American people and of freedom lovers everywhere. Madame Chiang is now in my country, and we welcome her both as a valiant ally and as a warm and honored friend.

The Republic of China stands ready on the flank of Communist aggression. The Republic of China is blocking the road of Communist expansion to the islands of the Pacific. The Republic of China and the magnificent forces of the Republic of South Korea are a deterring force to the announced Communist plans to conquer India, southeast Asia, and move into the Middle and Near East. I salute you for this magnificent contribution to world freedom.

I salute you also for the assistance you are giving to the free world effort in Vietnam. You are one of the almost 40 nations which are helping the gallant people of that beleaguered land build a better life at the same time that they defend themselves against a cruel aggression. Your country is giving assistance in the field of agriculture. You have built power stations. You have sent medical teams. You have trained more than 400 Vietnamese technicians. You have given warehouses, agricultural equipment, seeds and fertilizers, veterinary equipment and cattle, boats, airplanes, and over half a million textbooks. And you have been generous in extending to our forces fighting in Vietnam both material facilities and hospitality. You are playing your full role as part of the fraternity of freemen opposing aggression in Vietnam.

The United States is fighting in South Vietnam as a member of that fraternity of freemen. We are fighting there against stark Communist aggression by terrorism, infiltration, sabotage, deception, and murder—the most diabolical and dangerous form of aggression. We are fighting in South Vietnam to preserve the right of self-determination of nationalities. We are fighting for peace, as opposed to the spread of war. We are fighting to help all of you in a righteous cause. We are fighting to prevent a world war. We are fighting to prevent a world holocaust of unparalleled carnage and destruction.

We are daily growing stronger, on land, on sea, in the air, and in space. This strength is for freedom. This military might is dedicated to your independence, to your liberty. It will never be used for aggression, slavery, and conquest. The United States has no territorial designs anywhere in the world. We are for liberty and individual dignity and freedom for peoples everywhere. We believe in lending a helping hand to the diseased and the underprivileged throughout the world.

We are standing beside all of you in this struggle for freedom to preserve your ancient heritage, your art, your culture—which precedes ours—to preserve your civilization, which began thousands of years before ours. We share your hopes and your aspirations for

the future. In this age of science and astronautics, there is no room for Communist suspicion, hatred, bigotry, and deceit. I look to the future with hope and with confidence. I believe we are on the dawn of a new era.

The magnificent progress made on this island shows what free societies can accomplish. The growth in your production of both agricultural and industrial goods can only be described as startling. Your exports are rising, your economy is strong, your currency is sound. Most important of all, the benefits of this prosperity are going to the people. I am proud that my country has assisted you in your efforts. And I know that you are proud that through your own efforts you have done so well that in your country we have been able to end our foreign aid program.

The iron curtain in Europe and Asia is a manifestation of an inferiority complex. The iron curtain is necessary to hide tyranny and promote totalitarianism. The Iron Curtain is designed to keep people from knowing the truth—to prevent them from knowing the joys of freedom and self-determination of peoples, individual liberty, dignity, and economic opportunity.

I can assure you that the United States will stand firm throughout the world. We fought in Korea. We are fighting in Vietnam. We are with you here. We were with you in Korea, in Quemoy, and in Matsu. We are supporting SEATO in southeast Asia and NATO in Europe. We will oppose Communist aggression wherever it rears its ugly head.

The time has come to launch an offensive—an offensive of truth about freedom, the truth about stark Communist aggression and its sinister designs. We must offer hope for the captive peoples of the world to throw off the yoke of tyranny and again live in the sunlight of freedom. We must spread the truth, throughout the world, about Communist imperialism and colonialism. We must tell the truth about class hatred and race prejudice of Communist imperialists—the truth about their liquidations, murder, and deceit.

We must not reward Red Chinese aggression by giving Red China a seat in the United Nations. We must not dignify Red China by giving her a forum and a vote on the cause of freedom. We must not bolster her economic system with the trade of free nations and peoples dedicated to the cause of human dignity. It would be a grave mistake to bolster her sagging economy with the products of free enterprise nations. We must not make this same mistake again. The free nations of the world promoted trade with the dictators of World War II. It was their acquisition of products from free enterprise nations that largely enabled them to launch a war against private enterprise, property rights, dignity, and freedom of the individual. We cannot make this mistake again. Red China has the atomic bomb. She is perfecting the hydrogen bomb. Trade with the free world will enable her to have the hydrogen bomb, with which to launch an onslaught against civilization, in mass production at an early date. We must push our freedom offensive now.

Captive nations and peoples hold the key to the future security, independence, and freedom of the world. Remain steadfast in your struggle for freedom. Captive nations are the "Achilles heel" of Red Imperialist aggression. Communism fears your yearning, your desire for freedom. Communism fears your courage and your ability to someday rise and turn back the tide of tyranny.

You have our hearts. You have our sympathy, our support, and our understanding. We share your hopes. We share your aspirations. Most of all, we share your sure and certain vision of the future: Men will be free.

Misuse of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Bird, who is a member of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, has posed some serious questions and charges pertaining to our foreign aid program in the Republic of Chile.

Following one of the major earthquakes in Chile, the U.S. foreign aid program was stepped up to aid in the recovery from this major disaster. However, it seems that this aid and subsequent aid, according to Mr. Bird's memorandum, has not been allowed to filter down to those who were in greatest need. Charges of graft and corruption have often been voiced in this area and there is no valid reason why we should not establish rules for administering foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, the American public cannot be placated forever with pious answers and doubletalk which has no substance of meaning.

I have asked that the following memorandum from Mr. Bird be investigated by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Also, I am sending a copy of this memorandum to the officials of the CARE program so that they, too, may have the opportunity to look into the matter of CARE packages being sold, thus not reaching the poor.

Mr. Speaker, with the thought that my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might be interested in Mr. Bird's observations I include herewith the text of his memorandum:

I would like you to take this matter up with interested parties, regarding aid donated by the American people.

In 1960, I was living in Coronel, south of Concepcion, Chile, in a very poor section. The industry is mostly coal mining and the wages were very low. While I was there we had the largest earthquake in Chilean history. Here in America the quake made headlines in all the newspapers and there were vast sums of money and materials donated for that area, which was the center of the quake. I resided in that area for 3 months after the quake. And I didn't see any sign of materials or aid that were supposed to be donated for relief of the victims. When I left Chile, people were still camping in front of their ruined houses. Hundred of thousands of people never knew of any aid. Where does this aid go?

Four years later I was again living in Chile. This time in the north, in the small city of Iquique where I resided for 18 months. At various times, I have seen CARE packages on display in the store for sale. I purchased 8 kilos of flour for 3½ escudos, nearly \$1. In the 18 months that I lived in Iquique, I never met anyone who had ever received a CARE package and there are hundreds of thousands of poor people there. They didn't even know such a thing existed.

If we don't supervise the aid after it enters these countries, we are wasting our time and money.

I think this is a job for our highly rated Peace Corps in those areas. It would at least give them something useful to do. I have worked in many areas where the Peace Corps people are stationed and only about 25 percent are qualified to contribute anything to these areas, such as doctors, nurses, teachers and skilled technicians—the rest are just there for 2 years.

Example. I have seen pictures in magazines showing Peace Corps workers digging ditches in Latin America, when those people have known how to do that for 500 years.

Also, two Peace Corps workers came to Iquique, age about 20, to teach fishing. When they got on a fishing vessel, they were lost; they had to learn from the Chilean crew members, much to the amusement of the Chileans.

There are more Communists in Chile than I have seen anywhere else where I have worked. Most of the crew members that I instructed in fishing were Communist. Allende, the Communist Party leader, gained in most depressed areas of Chile. And if we don't get to these poorer classes of people in the next 4 years, the Communist Party has a good chance of getting in.

Therefore we must make sure we get credit for every dollar in aid we send there.

I think that is where the Peace Corps would come in useful, to see that anything we send to these countries gets to where it is supposed to go.

A national drive for good used clothing would be very welcome to these poor people. Nearly all American families have closets full of clothing they will never use again because they are tired of them. This material could be distributed by the workers of the Peace Corps, to be sure it gets to the right people.

My information is that aid donated by the American people is delivered to the principal port in each country, and then trusted to some local agency which may or may not be honest.

As an American taxpayer, I want to see us get full value for each dollar spent.

JACK BIRD, Seattle, Wash.

Concurrent Resolution of Michigan State Legislature Supporting President Johnson's Position on Vietnam Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 40, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, in support of President Johnson's position on the Vietnam issue:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Concurrent resolution supporting President Johnson's position on the Vietnam issue (Offered by Representatives Burton and Marshall)

Whereas the United States has for many years been committed to a definite policy in southeast Asia, which policy has declared intentions of the United States to support those governments of southeast Asia who are fighting communism; and

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- APPENDIX

A299

Whereas this policy has been supported by the two preceding Presidents of the United States as well as having such policy continued by the Johnson administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate hereby declare their firm belief and faith in President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam and southeast Asia and urge him to resist all tempting offers to negotiate a settlement which would be detrimental to the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the legislature respectfully urge the President of the United States to continue with his cautious but firm policy in matters involving southeast Asia and that the great majority of the peoples of this country heartily support the position being taken by his administration and the majority of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to President Johnson and to the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress for their consideration.

Adopted by the house December 9, 1965.

Adopted by the senate December 9, 1965.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Weaver Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, more than two-thirds of all Americans are city and suburban dwellers.

In a real sense, the job of the Federal Government is now concerned with the care of the people in these areas.

The job facing the newly appointed head of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the very able Robert C. Weaver, is a tremendously important one. His new Department must become the clearinghouse for urban and suburban problems.

A recent editorial in the New York Times calls this appointment "the beginning of another road along which vast new strides must be taken toward better living conditions."

I respectfully requested that the Times editorial on Dr. Weaver's appointment be included in the Record, and commend it to the reading of the membership of this body:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 15, 1966]

THE WEAVER APPOINTMENT

President Johnson's appointment of Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Renewal has been long expected.

A Harvard-trained economist, Dr. Weaver has Government experience dating from the early days of the Roosevelt administration. He is dedicated and knows the field to which he has been assigned; he was deputy State housing commissioner and later New York State Rent Administrator under Governor Harriman. President Kennedy subsequently

named him to the top housing post in the country. He has attained Cabinet level—first Negro in American history to do so—despite some criticism of his abilities and his imagination.

If the appointment of Robert Weaver to his new post is the end of the road in the sense that the struggle to put a Negro in the Cabinet is won, so is it the beginning of another road along which vast new strides must be taken toward better living conditions. "In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing as many as a hundred thousand people," the President said in his state of the Union message. "Working together, private enterprise and government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where our people can come to live the good life." It is Robert Weaver's task to direct and coordinate such an ambitious effort, and we wish him the best of luck in this monumental job.

Eccles Speaks Out on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing efforts by the President to seek a negotiated peace in South Vietnam, for which I am most grateful, and the pressure which he is undoubtedly being subjected to from many persons advocating total victory, I think we would all do well to note the recent words by Financier Marriner S. Eccles. I would like to request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times, January 4, 1966, wherein Mr. Eccles joins in urging that we not escalate the war in Vietnam:

FINANCIER ASSERTS UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ESCALATE WAR

SAN FRANCISCO.—"Under no circumstances should we escalate the war in Vietnam. Our position there is indefensible," says financier Marriner S. Eccles.

Eccles declares, "Contrary to Government propaganda, we were not invited by and have no commitment to any representative or responsible Government of South Vietnam."

"We are there as an aggressor in violation of our treaty obligation under the U.N. Charter."

Eccles' remarks appeared in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the Monday morning edition of the San Francisco Chronicle.

Now 75, Eccles was assistant to the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury in 1934 and has held several positions on the Federal Reserve Board.

U.S. ACTION CITED

Eccles said that after the Vietnamese victory over the French and the signing of the Geneva Treaty in 1954, the U.S. refused to allow free elections in Vietnam, "knowing that Ho Chi Minh, the Communist leader of the north, was so popular he would unquestionably win."

"The South Vietnamese Catholics, about 10 percent of the population, property owners, and business interests in the large cities, are the strong anti-Communist supporters of

South Vietnam, and are the minority," he continued.

"We have provided large amounts of military and economic aid and supplied them with military advisers," Eccles said. "But until the present administration came into office, we did not furnish American troops to help fight their war, until it was apparent they were being defeated."

"We have gradually taken over the direction to their Government as well as their war until now it has become an American war rather than a Vietnamese war."

As a result, Eccles said, "we now have aligned against us the powerful countries of China and Russia, including all the Communist world, with practically no support from the rest of the world in spite of Rusk's and McNamara's recent appeals to NATO."

"Under these conditions," he concluded, "we cannot win."

World Is a Small One for Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, world leaders have continued to be amazed at the vitality and effectiveness of one of our most able Ambassadors, Gov. W. Averell Harriman. Governor Harriman's familiarity with the principal world figures for more than a generation has assured his missions a friendly and respectful welcome wherever he goes.

Yesterday, Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post reported on an interview with the Governor following his most recent peace mission regarding the situation in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Roberts' article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

WORLD IS A SMALL ONE FOR HARRISON

(By Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post staff writer)

In the dark of last Wednesday evening William Averell Harriman, who will be 75 next November 15, ran down the ramp from his presidential jet at Andrews Air Force Base in nearby Maryland. It was the end of yet another talking trip.

Harriman has been talking straight talk to presidents, prime ministers, dictators, and other assorted political potentates since Harry Hopkins introduced him to the Roosevelt inner circle in early New Deal days.

For 22 days he zigzagged around the world as one of President Johnson's peace offensive envoys. Mr. Johnson put a lot of people into diplomatic orbit but somehow the memory fades of all but the extraordinary durable Harriman.

For Harriman the only world is extraordinary. On this 35,000-mile trip he touched down in 12 world capitals—he was in Bangkok 3 times—and none of them was new to him. Not only had he been to them all before but he had met every one of the leaders before with the single exception of Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser.

GREETED BY MENZIES

That wealth of experience clearly paid dividends. Australia's Robert Menzies, who came out to the airport in the late evening to greet him, was an old friend from World

War II days in London when the Aussie sat with the British War Cabinet.

Or take Yugoslavia's President Tito.

"I saw him in Brdo"—where they met again this time—"back in 1951 when Yugoslavia, after the break with Russia, feared Stalin would turn the satellites loose on him. We gave him planes and tanks."

Harriman paused and added: "When you've seen a man in his tough times, there's a certain relationship."

In Warsaw, Communist Party Boss Wladislaw Gomulka saw Harriman "for old time's sake." He once had been a house guest in Harriman's New York residence, years after they first met during the war.

"The Shah of Iran," says Harriman, "considers me one of his oldest friends. He stayed at my cottage in Sun Valley." Harriman, whose father created the Union Pacific Railroad, was of course the man who created that ski resort.

Harriman has a newspaperman's instincts about travel and he hasn't missed many corners of the world.

"If you haven't been to a country," as he puts it, "no matter how much information you have, you can't get a feel of it."

In fact Harriman feels so strongly about the right of Americans to travel that he once hired Dean Acheson to fight a potential case for him right up to the Supreme Court. Back in the Eisenhower years, when he had finished a term as Governor of New York (he was involuntarily retired by the voters in favor of Nelson Rockefeller) Harriman decided he wanted to go to Communist China.

THE 1959 TRIP CALLED OFF

At that time the State Department forbade such trips. But the test case never came off because at the last minute he received a message from Peiping saying it would not be convenient to receive him that year, 1959.

Of course, Harriman has been to China. He stopped off in Chungking, the wartime capital, to see Chiang Kai-shek on route home from Moscow in 1946. Everybody told him he ought to go on to Peiping but he had a date with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo, and so he missed his only chance to get the feel of today's center of the Asian Communist world.

"I was very serious in those days," he says with a sense of regret that he didn't put off the visit with the general another day or two to take in Peiping.

The Governor—everybody calls him that and he loves it despite the fact that his political skills turned out to be in an almost totally inverse ratio to his diplomatic abilities—had only 8 hours' warning of his latest trip. President Johnson called him at noon and he was airborne from Andrews at 8 p.m.

But the Governor was not unprepared this time even though he thought it was to be a trip of only a few days.

"I've been caught several times before," he explains, "on being sent to the tropics. So I usually take some tropical shirts along. I only wear one weight of wool suit anyway."

Although the presidential jet, with its huge "United States of America" legend emblazoned on each side, has a pair of bunks, the 6-foot-1-inch Harriman spent only 3 or 4 nights aboard in bed. At each stop, too, embassy wives reached for the soiled shirts and returned them in time for the Governor and his two globe-girdling aids, Asian Communist expert David Dean, and Christopher Squire, who is in charge of Hungarian affairs at State.

Harriman took no secretary. He penciled his dispatches on a yellow pad and got them off at the next stop. Dean and Squire alternated as note takers at the talks with the foreign leaders and then wrote up the detailed reports.

Harriman has his own philosophy about diplomatic messages.

"I write them short to the President and the Secretary of State. More people read the short ones. But I make them very much to the point. They have got to be reasonably entertaining. I learned that from the British. They pass around the Cabinet table the telegrams they get from their ambassadors. They never have a leak, either; I wish we could do as well."

"The Ambassador in Britain who writes the best has his career made. They have literary style. Sometimes exact reporting is not as important as being descriptive."

Harriman, of course, won't discuss the substance of his peace mission other than to say that "I got the impression that all the people I saw were anxious to see the fighting stop, although for differing reasons."

"The crocodile" method is to come to the point and wrap it up quickly. He had 45 minutes at the Peshawar airport with Pakistan's President Ayub Khan who, naturally, he has known since 1959.

IN WARSAW AT 3:30 A.M.

When he arrived in Warsaw, nonstop from Andrews, it was 3:30 in the morning by his wristwatch. But 45 minutes after the touchdown he was closeted with Poland's Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki.

"You can do an awful lot in an hour," he says.

Harriman, of course, was acutely conscious of the critical role the Sino-Soviet dispute plays in the war in Vietnam. Like other administration leaders, he feels that Moscow wants to see the war ended, that Peiping wants to see it continue and that Hanoi is trapped in between the two Communist giants.

It was Harriman, after the German surrender and before Japan fell, who inspired James Forrestal to write in his 1945 diary: "He said the outward thrust of communism was not dead and that we might well have to face an ideological warfare just as vigorous and dangerous as fascism or nazism." And that at a time when most Americans were putting their postwar hopes on a continuation of the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union.

Stalin himself confirmed Harriman's dire views that October when he told him that "we've decided to go our own way."

It was President Kennedy who first deeply involved Harriman in the Far East, especially in the China problem. Today he takes very seriously the hard words from Peiping such as Lin Piao's pronouncement that the underdeveloped nations of the "countryside" will surround and defeat the "cities" of North America and Western Europe.

He wants Americans to fully appreciate the danger from China. But he does not worry that in turning their eyes to the Far East they will be bemused into thinking that Washington and Moscow are about to become allies. He figures the Russians will make it evident it can't come to that.

Averell Harriman did not bring peace to Vietnam but he clearly enjoys the satisfaction of yet another job well done. The trip was tiring; a cold turned into an ear infection because of too-rapid descent and change in the cabin air pressure coming into Darwin, Australia.

Winging home across the Pacific, he played bridge with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Dean, Squires, and Rush's aid, C. Arthur (Buck) Borg, who had joined up in New Delhi and and who lives on his earnings, picked up a bit of change from Harriman who in 1952 was reputed to be worth \$40 million.

When they got to Honolulu and the luxury of the Royal Hawaiian Hotel, Harriman ducked into a sports shop, bought a \$6.95 pair of wildly yellow swimming trunks and headed into the sea at Waikiki.

There was no surfing this time. But he mused to a companion: "In my day, it was much more dangerous; they didn't have that stabilizing fin on the back of the board then."

George Paul Miller: The Conscience From California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker. It has been my rare privilege during the last 7 years to know and to work with Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Under his leadership the committee has considered the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bills which have brought the country's space programs from very preliminary stages to full operation. Much credit for this successful achievement is due to Chairman MILLER's knowledge and patience and parliamentary skill.

The magazine Challenge published by the General Electric Missiles and Space division recently printed an article about Congressman MILLER. So that our colleagues can have the opportunity to read this excellent portrayal, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: GEORGE PAUL MILLER: THE CONSCIENCE FROM CALIFORNIA

(One of the first things a boy learns on getting a drum is that he's never going to get another one. One of the first things a nation learns about getting a GEORGE MILLER is that we need more like him. The capable chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics relies on experience and commonsense in encouraging the Nation's space efforts. Here he speaks out on competition—among people, in industry, and with Russia.)

In a highly technical world like space, saturated with semantics like thermodynamics, gravity gradient, and accelerometers, if you were going to handpick a man in Government to head up the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics, you wouldn't pick the manager of a travel agency that failed, or a man who was on relief in depression days, or an ex official of a State fish and game commission.

You wouldn't, that is, unless the combination of all three turned out to be GEORGE PAUL MILLER, Congressman from California's 8th District, now in his 11th term in Washington, just shy of his 75th birthday, and still building momentum in a life he waited so long to begin.

And you might pick him for this job of spearheading the annual authorization of America's \$5 billion space program not because of his technical background (though he's an engineer and has learned the language); not because he's a taciturn politician (though associates say he can settle disputes better than most), and not because of his experience (though he's served five Presidencies).

You pick GEORGE MILLER because he's a trustworthy guardian of the public investment; because he asks questions until he gets answers we can all understand, and because he's dedicated to the idea that America will not ride on the back of the space

the curbstone. Neither he nor his wife ever has been on relief.

Edward Taylor of 810 North Illinois made it through the eighth grade. He was in civil service work at Oak Ridge, Tenn., then was transferred to Fort Harrison "until the soldiers took over" in 1949. Since then he has been unable to find steady employment.

Most of the other men I talked with have similarly steady, modest backgrounds. They are grateful to have the curbstone job mart as a door to temporary employment. They prefer that it not be called the "slave market." Their pay runs from 75 cents to \$1.25 or \$1.50 an hour as a rule, depending upon the type of work they get.

Most of these good men are victims of the new technology. They are among 3 million employable but unemployed Americans. To most of these beyond the twenties or thirties, retraining and other war on poverty devices offer scant prospects.

What they need is what Fred Gibson said is part of being a man—steady jobs. And they need them now. This strongly suggests a need for Federal action to create those jobs. It was Abraham Lincoln, not Karl Marx, who said the Government "should do for the people what the people cannot do themselves or as well themselves."

Affirmation: Vietnam

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the university and college students of Georgia have initiated and organized Affirmation: Vietnam, a project which has my approval and unqualified support. My colleagues here in the House have expressed their pride in these young people, and I join with them in applauding this expression of constructive patriotism.

The original impetus came from a group of students at Emory University in Atlanta, and now includes representation and support from most colleges and universities throughout the State. Its sponsors include Senators RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN TALMADGE and other notable Georgians and Atlantans, as well as the entire Georgia delegation to the House of Representatives. Remar M. Sutton, Jr., is providing excellent coordination of the movement in his capacity as general chairman.

The culmination of Affirmation: Vietnam will be a rally at Atlanta Stadium on February 12. It is a very special honor that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a native Georgian and product of Georgia schools, will make the major address.

Students have traditionally and historically occupied a unique place in our society. Their enthusiasm and intelligence have been joined to many causes, and they have not hesitated to debate the issues with clear candor, and without regard to personal gain.

In recent months, the students voice has often protested our commitment in southeast Asia. Therefore, this spontaneous movement by Georgia students is deeply gratifying and reassuring.

I am proud to be connected with this project, and I hope that the demonstration of support for the reasoned principles of our country's commitment will be noted by the rest of our Nation.

Johnson and Party Repairing Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I had inserted in the RECORD an article by Walter Pincus relative to the Democratic National Committee finances. Another of his articles on the same subject appeared in the Sunday Star of January 23. In order to complete the story, the article follows:

**MONEY AND POLITICS—JOHNSON AND PARTY
REPAIRING IMAGE
(By Walter Pincus)**

Stung by recent criticism, President Johnson and his top political aids are moving to improve the Democratic Party's darkened fundraising image.

At the same time, however, financial demands of this year's congressional election activities may resurrect the bad image just as fast as the Democrats try to knock it down.

As a first step in image building, negotiations are underway to transfer some \$800,000 raised by the newest \$15,000 a page Democratic ad book to a bipartisan foundation which—with matching funds from the Republican National Committee—would openly conduct voter registration drives prior to next fall's election.

The ad book, which drew funds from 68 corporations, was promoted by the Democrats last summer behind a veil of secrecy. As originally conceived, the proceeds were to go to Democratic candidates who distribute the books at fundraising movie premieres.

DIRECT MAIL PLAN

As a second image-building step, the Democrats soon will begin a modest direct mail solicitation for small contributions. In recent years, the Democrats have received almost 80 percent of their funds from donors of over \$100—most of them \$1,000 givers.

An effort last year to stimulate small contributions through a contest was a dismal failure. So few people entered that winners at the State level have not even been announced.

President Johnson, himself, started off the new fundraising approach with his campaign fund reform proposals in the state of the Union message. Among the suggestions—still to be transmitted in detail to Congress—was a tax relief proposal for political contributions. This is aimed at stimulating small donations.

In contrast to the Democrats, the Republican Party has since 1962 reported raising a sizable proportion of its funds from donors of \$100 or less.

As politically attractive as the imagemaking proposals are, they actually will cost more money than they will raise.

With the need to raise some \$4 million this year to support the national Democratic program, party leaders hope their top fundraiser—the President—will be able to carry

out appearances at five or six dinners around the country.

The President's recent gall bladder operation cost the national committee some \$1 million. Almost \$400,000 of that figure would have been collected at a California function Johnson had planned to attend. When he was unable to go, the California promoters refused to hold the affair and held onto some \$300,000 already collected. That event apparently has been rescheduled for April.

TWO WASHINGTON EVENTS

Several fundraising appearances of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, which bring in additional funds to Washington, were canceled when the President asked him to stay in Washington during his postoperative period.

This year, along with out-of-town Presidential appearances, the Democrats are planning on two affairs in Washington to bring in money.

The financial attraction of the Nation's Capital as a campaign fund source is irresistible. The entire take of an affair, rather than just half the proceeds, go to the Democratic National Committee. In addition, the city is bulging with people who understand politics and respond to requests for contributions.

Lobbyists, trade association representatives, and Government employees to make the city the best place to hold either a dinner—as has been suggested for this spring—or an entertainment gala—as is being talked of for midsummer.

However, fundraising in Washington has its drawbacks—the prime one being the uproar over organized Democratic solicitation of Federal employees. Such protests have developed over the past 5 years.

All the attempts at imagemaking could be destroyed if the party resumes its intricate, organized, and illegal solicitation of Federal employees by their more politically oriented coworkers.

INQUIRY IS CLOSED

Last year, the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department were forced to review the activities of officials in the Rural Electrification Administration after allegations were made and partially confirmed that tickets to the 1964 Johnson gala were being sold on office time to subordinates.

Justice recently announced it had closed the inquiry without finding sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution.

Such organized in-house soliciting also was planned for last year's Democratic congressional dinner. Though it was stopped in some departments after being revealed in the press, other agencies carried it on successfully.

Another aspect of Democratic 1966 fundraising will be promotion of the \$1,000 a membership President's Club, which since 1964 has supplied a heavy proportion of the party's funds. Though it creates the "fat cat" image, the President's Club funds will be needed to provide the major part of this year's campaign money.

Tomorrow, HUMPHREY and other top administration and party leaders will attend the New York City President's Club kickoff meeting. Over 500 have been invited to attend the closed briefing—and subsequently contribute \$1,000 to the party.

Similar events are being set up around the country, and probably will precede both the Washington and out-of-town fundraising appearances of Johnson.

SECOND AD BOOK DOUBTFUL

The bad publicity generated by this year's ad book limits chances that another book will be attempted this year. However, if the need for funds demand it, the Democrats may put together a volume to accompany the gala.

Over 100,000 of this year's book—a valentine to President Johnson entitled "Toward

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A279

LOUISVILLE MAN HEADS HEART GROUP

The election of Philip P. Ardery as chairman of the board of directors of the American Heart Association was announced yesterday. Mr. Ardery, a Louisville lawyer, succeeds John D. Brundage. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower continues as honorary chairman of the association.

Mr. Ardery retired last July as a major general in the Air Force Reserve. In World War II he won seven U.S. decorations and the Croix de Guerre.

Active for more than a decade in heart association work, Mr. Ardery has been a member of the group's national board and executive committee since 1958. In 1962 he received the association's award of merit for distinguished service to its programs.

One of Our Commissioners Is Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following communication has been sent by me to the House Republican conference, but I believe it may prove of interest to all our colleagues:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION VACANCY—
FAILURE TO FILL

For almost 7 months—since July 1, 1965—a vacancy has existed on the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This vitally important body with an annual budget exceeding \$2 billion is functioning at 80 percent of its statutory manpower level. The management of its vast complex of scientific and industrial activities rides heavy on the shoulders of four rather than a proper complement of five supervising Commissioners. The input of thought, judgment, experience and wisdom into Commission decisions affecting both U.S. nuclear defense and American progress in peaceful uses of the atom continues month after month to remain starved by a factor of 20 percent.

Yet the Johnson administration remains totally unconcerned. Washington hears not the slightest rumor whatever of any possibility of a new Commissioner to replace Dr. Mary I. Bunting, who returned to the campus of Radcliffe College last June 30.

This regrettable state of affairs follows on the heels of an equally regrettable body blow to the Commission's force level dealt by the same Johnson administration in 1964. This involved the appointment of Dr. Bunting herself in that year with the understanding and agreement of the White House that she would remain away from her teaching responsibilities only for a year. During her year in Washington, Dr. Bunting proved to be a brilliant, hard working, and able Commissioner. Expectedly, however, most of her year was devoted to learning the job. She left, therefore, at the very moment of emergence into a capability to assume her full share of the Commission's workload.

The administration knew, or should have known, at the time it appointed her that such would be the case. There were other candidates for the 1964 vacancy who were willing and able to serve the full term, which Dr. Bunting was not. Nevertheless, she was selected, because at that moment the administration was going through one of its periodic "appoint women to office" weeks.

All of this is a record of bad government administration. The people should know it. They are entitled to something better. The

Commission vacancy should be filled promptly by a person of high competence who will agree to serve the term.

Roy Wilkins on Hogwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of nonsense is being spoken and written today by individuals in an effort to ridicule this Nation's efforts to cope with the causes and effects of poverty.

Two columnists writing in the current issue of the Indianapolis Observer provide a most welcome change from what appears to be an increasingly active and deliberately misleading campaign.

Neither Roy Wilkins nor John Ackel-mire, the Observer's columnists, will allow to go unchallenged the bumper stickers which smugly proclaim, "I'm fighting poverty. I work for a living."

These two writers display honesty and realism in discussing the difficult circumstances in which the unwilling victims of the "new technology" find themselves. For that reason, I take this opportunity to insert their comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Observer]

ROY WILKINS ON HOGWASH

It is easy for most white people to think of Negro life as one long physical hardship. They remember lynchings and the victims of beatings and shootings. They know about bombings and burned-out homes and churches.

Where Negroes are free of all this, or most of it, the public cries out, along with the young California guardsman in Watts: "What do they want? They never had it so good. These are not slums like Harlem."

There are other cruelties besides lynching and the Negro is not insensitive to them. One is the popular myth that the race doesn't want to work, that it prefers welfare payments.

Today the not-so-subtle insult is repeated by rightwing critics and speakers and parrots belonging to this or that society, but calling themselves generally, "conservatives." The latest dig is to be found on automobile bumper stickers:

"I'm fighting poverty. I work for a living."

The implication is as plain as it is smug. It says there is work aplenty for those who do not work. It says that those who do not work are deliberately choosing the assistance of antipoverty and welfare programs. It says, further, with an air of self-righteousness, "We who work are paying the bills for those who choose to enjoy poverty."

Every student of the most elementary economics of a capitalistic society knows this to be hogwash, and pretty smelly even for that concoction.

Statistics don't mean so much to people who think and live by slogans, but the fact is that 3 million Americans are hunting for work and cannot get a job. In the midst of our affluence we simply have not solved the problem of what to do about workers dislodged by technology, not by laziness.

One element of the formula for unemployment is a dark skin. It is true nationally that the unemployment rate for Negroes is

twice that for whites, but in some localities it is as much as four times the white rate. In the Watts district of Los Angeles last August 1 out of every 3 Negroes was unemployed.

In Michigan computers are bringing thousands of different cars off the assembly line equipped by orders on punchcards. In Ohio a machine drills 250 cylinder blocks at once. In Louisiana a computer fills drums with chemicals. In Chicago a computer mixes and bakes cakes. On a single Dixie plantation a cottonpicking machine displaces 50 Negro families.

These changes and wholesale regional and family disruptions and the myriad personal tragedies that flow from them will not be remedied by the auto-bumper philosophers. They are too busy working—until they reach the brutal cutoff age of 45, that is.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Observer]

JOHN ACKELMIRE: THE DISINHERITED

Come along to the slave market. It is in front of the old city hall at Ohio and Alabama. The scene could be—but won't be—especially instructive to those social illiterates one generation removed from honest Hoosier barnyards who have managed to translate their fiscal luck in this fabulous economy into a self-righteous contempt for the unemployed.

Each morning long before sunup 2 dozen or more jobless Negroes gather at the curbstone on North Alabama in hope somebody will come by and offer them an honest day's toil. There are a few winos and incompetents among them. But the vast majority are versatile, able-bodied men about as desperate for employment as it is possible to be. They arrive, poorly clad against the pre-dawn's icy bite, and they stand on the sidewalk in orderly array until picked up or hope is abandoned.

Do they enjoy poverty? Are they living high off the hog on welfare? Do they deserve to be insulted by bumper stickers reading, "I'm fighting poverty, I work for a living?"

Fred Gibson is 62. He lives at 2238 North College and walks the distance each morning to the curbstone in the 200 block of North Alabama. He is twice a widower; his second wife died last February after a 26-year marriage. He has 4 grown children and 13 grandchildren. He is the sole support of one daughter, now separated from her husband, and two grandchildren. The daughter is expecting a third child in 3 months.

Fred Gibson has lived in Indianapolis more than 40 years. He never got beyond the fifth grade, although his felicitous manner of speech and wide range of self-gathered knowledge suggest considerably more formal education. In his time he has had some fair jobs—landscape gardening, construction work, hod carrying and fry cooking. The only really well-paying job he ever had, though, was a brief stint in a World War II war plant. He never has owned a house or car.

But neither has he ever been on public welfare nor has he ever gone to a township trustee for relief. He has no police record. "I have always tried to be a man," he said the other day, "and part of that is holding a steady job."

In recent times a steady job has eluded Fred Gibson. So he goes down to the curbstone each morning in hope of a day's pick-and-shovel or tile-laying work. If he is lucky, he may make as much as \$25 or \$30 a week. His rent takes \$16 of that. ("I don't know how I'm going to pay this week's rent," he said.)

Roy Conn, 55, of 303 West 10th, has lived in Indianapolis since 1928. He is a graduate of Louisville Central High School. For 17 years he parked cars in a downtown lot, but of late he has had to catch as catch can at

A278

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 24, 1966

into one sovereign and independent republic of the Ukrainian people.

Although the Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of States, including the Government of Soviet Russia, it had no durable peace nor prosperity because Communist Russia invaded the Ukrainian state despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainian independence.

For nearly 3½ years, without assistance from the Western World, the Ukrainian people waged a heroic war against Communist Russia in the defense of sovereignty of their country but the gallant struggle came to a tragic end. The free Ukrainian state was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialist Republic.

Since the Russian Communist enslavement with brutal oppression and domination there has been much suffering among these people. But despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination and are continuing to struggle for freedom and national independence. Through a series of heroic and bloody uprisings and a steady resistance through underground warfare, the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their undying love of freedom and their opposition to alien slavery and oppression.

Both the Congress and the President of the United States have recognized the legitimate right to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July 1959, which enumerated the Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and is entitled to recognition and moral support by the American people and the free world at large. During the debate on colonialism in the U.N. Assembly in 1960 and 1961 a number of Western statesmen, including our Ambassador to the U.N. raised their voices in protest against the persecution of the Ukrainian people by the Communists.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire since the Communist menace has spread into Asia, our shores in Cuba and Latin America, it has become a political necessity for the free world to recognize that an independent Ukraine would substantially weaken the Communist empire.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on Sunday, January 23, 1966, in a solemn and fitting manner with special religious services and programs which will be heard on radio and TV over stations in Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, and Dickinson.

We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. We, therefore, respectfully request that you make an appropriate statement on the floor of the Senate on or about the 22d of January in commemoration of the 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence. This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Senate and American people but also for the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

It may also provide better understanding by extending diplomatic relations to Ukraine, which is a charter member of the United Nations, by nominating an American of Ukrainian descent to serve on some diplomatic post, and by the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of Europe's freedom fighter and Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko.

We extend our sincere thanks and appreciation for the favorable response in the past on this and other matters, and we hope

that you will continue to accept our expressions with meaningful understanding.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch of
North Dakota.

No Quick, Easy Solution to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, after a visit to Vietnam last month I concluded that the most important contribution the average American can make to the war in Vietnam is patience. There is no quick and easy solution.

The nationally syndicated writer, Ralph McGill, in a recent column, compared the fighting conditions in Vietnam to an episode in our own history. He noted that Marion the Swamp Fox, using guerrilla tactics, "kept a large force of well-equipped British troops engaged across a long period of time." Four major expeditions by the British against him were unsuccessful.

Indeed it is frustrating to hold the power to devastate completely an entire enemy country and not be able to use that power.

Mr. McGill's column, published in the January 13 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, is an excellent answer to the question: "Why not win in Vietnam?"

Under leave to extend my remarks I include it at this point in the RECORD:

NEITHER POWER NOR VICTORY ARE
ENOUGH FOR VIETNAM

(By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA.—"Why not victory now?" "Why not win in Vietnam?" "Why don't we get it over with?"

"What's wrong with winning?" "Why can't this great power kick out that rabble of guerrillas in Vietnam?"

These and other idiocies, born of frustration, echo in the land of the free and the home of the brave. (It is a land that ought to understand, out of its own history, the frustration in Vietnam. Our own history includes Marion, the Swamp Fox. He based himself in a swamp and kept a large force of well-equipped British troops engaged across a long period of time. On four occasions, major expeditions were mounted against him. He eluded them. Marion was one of the factors that enabled final victory to be won. The more effective units of our continental army were, in effect, guerrilla troops, operating out of their knowledge of terrain and of living off the country.)

The United States would win. Winning would, in a sense, be easy. Congressman CHARLES WELTNER, speaking in his Georgia district, said to the impatient and frustrated:

"Certainly, it would be a simple matter to bring about, within 24 hours, the utter devastation of all of North Vietnam. We could kill every able-bodied fighting man there—along with every little child, every woman, every old man—all within the twinkling of an eye. We can win—if winning means wiping out 16 million human beings; and if winning includes the very real chance of direct military engagement with Commu-

nist China; and if winning includes the probable necessity for using nuclear weapons against Peiping; and if winning includes the possible destruction of Russia—after, of course, Russia has simultaneously destroyed 100 million American lives.

"We have the power to win—if we want to win under these circumstances. That power has gone unexercised, to the mounting frustration of us all, and to the increasing demand that we do something. We sincerely seek an honorable peace and, I am convinced, are willing to go the extra mile. We will not, however, negotiate a peace that would mean the inevitable loss of southeast Asia to the thralldom of China."

The world should have learned out of its many wars and "victories" that great power is not enough—not nearly enough. Nor is "victory" enough. Two tremendous wars enveloped most of the earth. They were "won" with a vast mobilization of power, men, materials, and food. A Korean war was waged, bloodily and indecisively.

It was said of this harsh conflict that it was waged to contain Communist aggression. That was true. But it was not all the truth. We were then, as now, confronted with two Communist giants. Since that time, the second one, China, has detonated two nuclear devices. More are on the way. Russia, believing that communism eventually will triumph, seems willing, in the face of power, to build her own economy and avoid aggression. China, with a growing birthrate and an increasingly serious lack of food and viability in her economy, believes in and seeks aggression. Yet, in the last 2 months her attempts to infiltrate and subvert African governments have failed. A plot to make Indonesia a Peiping puppet was thwarted.

Peiping-trained Thailanders now are in open opposition in north Thailand. The story goes on and on.

Neither power alone, nor victory alone, is enough. What this country seeks to do is to mobilize all our power—our wealth of goods, money and arms—to seek the slow way, a new sort of "victory."

Heart Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of January 10, 1966, noting the election of Philip P. Ardery of Louisville, Ky., as chairman of the board of directors of the American Heart Association.

Mr. Ardery distinguished himself in World War II, leading an air squadron on D-day and since has been equally distinguished as a member of the bar and as a devoted worker in the field of civic affairs.

I am sure that he will continue to provide effective leadership to the American Heart Association as chairman of the board of directors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A277

ican system which our deliberations disclose as necessary. It seems to me that the task might be entrusted after this Conference to one or more bodies which would carry forward our work in preparation for a special conference, under article III of the charter, to meet possibly within the next 6 months.

At this stage I should like to advance for consideration some of the ideas that the United States believes could contribute to making our organization a more effective instrument.

First, the United States favors annual OAS meetings at ministerial level. The interaction and speed of developments in our hemisphere and elsewhere make it highly desirable that we meet with more regularity and frequency than we have before. The consultations should not be confined to our hemispheric problems alone. Developments in other areas might be reviewed both for their implications for us, as well as for what we might do to further the cause of peace and freedom elsewhere.

Second, we should strengthen the organizational relationship among the key organs of the system: the Ministers, the Council, the Economic and Social Council, CIAP, and the Secretariat. Our objective should be to integrate the various facets of our collective effort; to insure they are responsive to the agreed policies of governments; to insure that cooperation in the political, economic, social and cultural fields are mutually reinforcing and to insure that new operational tasks are carried forward with administrative efficiency and dispatch.

Third, in our forward planning we should think not only of measures to deal with a conflagration once it has broken out, but also of preventive steps the Organization might helpfully take in a dispute or situation in this hemisphere before it has reached the crisis stage. There is wisdom in the old diplomatic tradition—incorporated in United Nations doctrine—that bilateral disputes are best settled bilaterally. Nevertheless, the Council might be empowered to consider a dispute or situation at the request of one or more American Republics; to recommend procedures for peaceful settlement; and perhaps to recommend provisional measures designed to prevent an aggravation of the situation. The Council, in carrying out such functions, could avail itself of assistance from the Inter-American Peace Committee, from special commissions, and from the Secretary General.

Fourth, the United States would also support strengthening the institution and role of the Secretary General, authorizing him to bring to the attention of the Council any matter which, in his opinion, may endanger peace and security in the hemisphere.

Fifth, there is the question of joint action. Both in the Cuban missile crisis and in the Dominican situation, the discharge by the OAS of its responsibilities involved not merely the assumption of political responsibility but also the employment of units of the armed forces of various member states. These were contributed voluntarily and operated collectively under a combined command. In the crises of 1962, this action was decisive. In the case of the Dominican Republic, the Inter-American Peace Force made a vital contribution to the avoidance of needless bloodshed and the creation of conditions for the Dominican people to determine their own future by votes and not by arms. Its importance is attested by the fact that the Provisional government has called upon it for continued assistance in the maintenance of peace and stability.

The United Nations has, of course, had much more experience than has the OAS in this type of multilateral peacekeeping force. Many of your countries have made personnel available for both United Nations observation and military operations in several crisis situations.

It may, therefore, be useful for us to examine, in the light of experience and the nature of our collective responsibilities for peace and security in the hemisphere, and elsewhere, the desirability of establishing these voluntary contributions to international peacekeeping operations on a more orderly basis in advance of their possible future use by the OAS or by the U.N.

If we face the fact that we live in troubled times, if we face the fact that there are those who seek with purpose and persistence to destroy democracy. I believe, if we are patient, we shall find a creative way to recognize two important principles: first, we ought to be prepared to move fast and effectively and, if possible, together when a dangerous situation arises in the hemisphere; second, none of our governments is prepared to engage its military forces except by a national decision, at the highest level, in the light of particular circumstances.

Sixth, I would note the need to avoid within our hemisphere competitive arms races. Our resources are desperately needed for economic and social development. With all its imperfections we are blessed by the most mature and reliable system for regional security and peacekeeping on the face of the planet. As military budgets are formulated we should keep these facts before us—and the examples, past and present, of the burdens and consequences of all arms races.

The experience of the Cuban missile crises gave to the Western Hemisphere a heightened awareness of the need to control modern weapons and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. One of the initiatives that received added impetus in 1962 was the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. The United States has followed with keen and sympathetic interest the efforts of Latin American countries to work out agreed arrangements for excluding the proliferation, the stationing, or storage of nuclear weapons within the territory of Latin American States. We have noted the encouraging progress toward this end which was made during the current year at discussions in Mexico City. The United States believes the project of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America is constructive statesmanship in the best tradition of the hemisphere. We welcome the effort and would be glad to see it reach a successful conclusion.

I should also note that our membership may expand.

The emergence of two new, independent states—Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago—caused our organization to devise a formula for the admission of members. We found the formula without need to alter the charter. The door is now open to additional countries to join the OAS. We will welcome them wholeheartedly at such time as they wish to avail themselves of this opportunity.

vii

This, as we see it, is the panorama of our common tasks.

The intent of my country to work with you in the common quest for freedom and prosperity has never been as strong as it is today—to build together and together to protect what we are building. President Johnson has summed it up this way:

“Our charter charges each American country to seek to strengthen representative democracy. Without that democracy and without the freedom it nourishes, material progress is an aimless enterprise, destroying the dignity of the spirit that it is really meant to liberate. So we will continue to join with you and encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle.”

Thus we would reaffirm the faith of my Government in the effectiveness and vitality of our regional system. It has served to bring new levels of understanding and good will between our peoples. It has served to promote freedom and democracy. It has

served, and is increasingly serving, as a means for achieving material well-being and social justice for our nations. It has served to keep the peace in this hemisphere and to protect us from our enemies.

The Organization has demonstrated its flexibility and adaptability to change in the past. I am confident that it will continue to do so in the future.

The challenge in this old hemispheric system is like the challenge of domestic political life: to transform and modernize policies and institutions in harmony with abiding principles and values, so that the problems of today and tomorrow can be met.

Together I am confident we shall meet that challenge.

The 48th Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine. On this occasion, Americans of Ukrainian descent all across the land took part in special observances to once again bring to the attention of the world how a free, independent nation was forced under the yoke of communism.

In a recent letter to me, Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., discusses the special programs planned for North Dakota. These included special religious services which were broadcast over radio and television throughout a broad area of North Dakota.

In his letter, Dr. Zukowsky made an excellent case for setting forth the necessity of maintaining our commitment to the people of the Ukraine and other nations who live under Communist tyranny. We cannot forget these people and their desire to obtain freedom. We must continue to support them and help them to advance in every possible way the independence they seek.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Zukowsky's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Steele, N. Dak., January 15, 1966.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We want to again call to your attention that in the month of January Ukrainians all over the world including our State, will mark the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine, which took place on the 22d of January in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine, also the 47th anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22, 1919, whereby Western Ukraine united with the National Ukrainian Republic

Or we can choose, as wise commanders do, to fight on a front where we can win, to fight the war against want. It is the most important war the race of man ever faced, a war we can win, and a war from which our Nation can come off stronger and richer—richer in moral, spiritual, and material ways.

We have a disproportionate share of the world's arable land resources. They are not enough to meet the whole world's food deficits, but we also have unrivaled agricultural production and handling know-how which can increase productivity around the world. And we have a system of democratic government with freedom and enterprise which, copied throughout the world, can help to increase affluence everywhere.

We can fight the war against want with corn instead of cannon, with farmers instead of marines, with tractors instead of tanks, with nitrogen used in fertilizer instead of explosives, with technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear, and with development instead of destruction.

All men can be winners in such a war—just as we are real winners today in the war against domestic want which was started in the thirties to end the paradox of want and surpluses here at home. As we ended the depression in the thirties, and as we have created jobs and eliminated poverty in post-World War II days, we have enjoyed growing prosperity, and growing affluence.

A world war against want would be an extension, beyond our national boundaries, of a policy adopted by our first President and Congress that has brought us to our present greatness, strength, and prosperity.

George Washington, Albert Gallatin, and our earliest national leaders worked for Federal programs to bring about development of new areas. We have continued programs to stimulate the expansion of productivity across our land down to the present time. As geographical frontiers have disappeared, we have gone back to redevelop and upgrade the economic activity of some of our own less developed areas and to expand vertically.

The Tennessee Valley, the Columbia Basin development, the great western reclamation projects, and now Appalachia and the planned regional commissions in New England, the Ozarks, the upper Great Lakes, and my own upper Great Plains area are examples of that policy.

These area developments have paid dividends to the Nation as well as the immediate territory involved.

Tennessee Valley counties bear twice the share of the Federal tax burden today that they carried in 1935. They pay twice as much income tax. That means they import and export twice as much or more from the rest of the Nation. Their contribution to the total economic strength of the Nation has doubled. The Columbia Basin has become an economic bastion of the Nation as a whole.

The flowback of benefits from economic development abroad is just as clear economically as the flowback from our own regional developments, and it has returns in terms of world peace and human freedom not involved in our own regional development projects.

We gave Japan food assistance after World War II. Japan is today our largest foreign market for agricultural commodities. She buys from us each year more than we granted her over several years.

The Department of Agriculture has made a study of our exports to 54 developing nations which we have given food-for-peace aid. For every 10 percent rise in per capita income their purchases of agricultural commodities from the United States have increased 21 percent.

An in-depth study by the Department of Agriculture, "Foreign Economic Growth and Market Potentials for U.S. Agricultural Products," concludes:

"The results of this study clearly indicate a definite and positive relationship between growth in income and trade. They also indicate that expansion in the demand for U.S. agricultural and other products will continue to be closely tied to world economic conditions. Rapid economic development will help maintain a steady growth in U.S. agricultural and total trade; * * * market outlets for an increasing part of American agricultural products will become more and more dependent upon the rate of economic progress in other countries. And, since the greatest market potential for U.S. agricultural products is in the developing countries, it would be in our own economic interest to help promote economic growth in these less-developed countries."

The techniques for using food assistance to stimulate development in the emerging nations of the world are well known to the agencies that administer our food-for-peace programs.

The voluntary agencies like CARE, Catholic Family Welfare, and the others use grant food for wages on community and rural development projects—and it is rural development that is most needed to meet the challenge of the food and population crisis.

The soft currencies which recipient nations pay for food-for-peace supplies under title I of Public Law 480 are loaned back from many types of development projects; a considerable amount is earmarked for American private business firms to borrow to start business in the issuing countries.

A war against want will require a decade or more to win.

There are bottlenecks of dock facilities, storage facilities, transportation, and of knowledge on how to use our foods, which must be broken. India does not have conventional port facilities adequate to unload the food she needs right now from the ships that bring it to her shores.

We cannot pour food into a less developed country in quantities or on terms which will destroy the incentive for their own farmers to increase their production, as they must if the race with growing population is to be won. We must help those countries with our know-how and supplies to achieve maximum self-sufficiency. There are many other problems, including increasing the support of other developed lands.

But if our great Nation has the skill to put a man on the moon, it has the skills necessary to solve the distribution and development problems connected with a major world food effort.

President Lyndon Johnson, in his state of the Union message, has called for a maximum effort to meet food, education, and health problems in a worldwide attack. He did not call for a limited effort.

I had the pleasure of reporting in the U.S. Senate last Friday that support given my proposed international food and nutrition bill reflected unprecedented unanimity among American citizens.

All of the four major farm organizations favor moving our international food effort from surplus disposal to production to meet the needs of men. Labor organizations and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are in support. Church groups, professional groups, the college and university community, and scores upon scores of newspapers and magazines—leaders of the fourth estate—have expressed support. The endorsements are bipartisan, and by far the most extensive spontaneous outpouring I have ever known behind any proposal.

We have yet one gamut to run.

Space technologists and the electronics industry think they are the inventors of a new technique of miniaturization.

We have had experts at that technique in Government for a good many years. They

sometimes serve a useful purpose, but not always. The war against want, the race between food and population, cannot be won with any miniaturized, pilot projects. It cannot be fought on weekends and holidays. It cannot be won with left-overs.

This war, from which our Nation and mankind can benefit eternally, can only be fought and won if we recognize it as the most important war in the history of mankind and if, in President Johnson's words, we make a "maximum, worldwide effort."

The war against want cannot ultimately be avoided.

What we do about it this year—in 1966—may very well determine whether 15 or 20 or 25 years from now the less developed world has become a world of self-sustaining, cash customers of both our agricultural and industrial industries, of if it is a cauldron of unrest and danger to the peace of the world, which can be brought into a balanced relationship between food and population only by the expenditure of greatly increased amounts for assistance and grants as a result of population growth and lagging development.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTH VIETNAM AT THE ARMED FORCES CONGRESS IN SAIGON

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, on January 15, I was in Saigon. On that day, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam, Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, spoke at the closing ceremony of the Armed Forces Congress, made up of approximately 1,500 officers, who serve in every area of South Vietnam.

In perhaps its most important feature, Prime Minister Ky declared that the Republic of Vietnam should set forth on the road to constitutional democracy. In his speech, he outlined procedures for the drafting of a constitution providing for democratic institutions, and plans to have the constitution voted on by the people at the end of 1966, with elections for office to be held a year later.

A second feature of the address is the stress on the pacification and rebuilding of the civilization. It indicates the importance which Prime Minister Ky attaches to bringing about a peaceful improvement in the living standards of the people. It is a statement that the Central Government is concerned about people throughout the country, and that his Government is taking vigorous action to demonstrate its concern.

I met with Prime Minister Ky and secured a copy of his speech from the U.S. Embassy. I believe it important that it should be printed in the RECORD, so that the full text will be available to the Members of the Congress of the United States and to the people of our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER NGUYEN CAO KY
AT THE CLOSING CEREMONY OF THE ARMED
FORCES CONGRESS, JANUARY 15, 1966

Dear fellow Vietnamese, dear comrades in arms, in the course of national events, each period should provide an opportunity

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

955

"It is obvious," Long says, "that this proliferation of snooping paraphernalia is increasingly placing the constitutional right of privacy of the individual citizen in peril."

"Surveillance is becoming more and more pervasive in our lives, and privacy is becoming harder to protect."

"If we expect to have any privacy in 1984 or 1985—we must examine the probable advances in technology, and we must provide stringent laws against indiscriminate eavesdropping."

"As incredible as it may seem, there are virtually no statutes, Federal, or State, to protect against eavesdropping, indiscriminate or otherwise."

Beirne argues that eavesdropping and wiretapping equipment of all types should be registered and that all users of such equipment must be licensed by the Federal Government.

In the licensing provisions he urges that strict limits be placed on the eligibility of agencies and individuals entitled to use such equipment.

"In discussing the weapons of eavesdropping and wiretapping," Beirne says, "we are talking about weapons as dangerous to democracy, to personal dignity, and to individual freedom as thermonuclear weapons are to human survival."

"We do not equip the State militia with thermonuclear missiles. Nor can the cop on the beat or the bank guard or the private detective avail himself of tactical nuclear weapons."

"For the survival of privacy, dignity, and freedom, for the survival of those things that make human survival most meaningful, let us sharply limit the number and drastically limit the use of all forms of wiretap and eavesdropping equipment."

A WAR THAT ALL CAN WIN—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR MCGOVERN OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, on January 18, 1966, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN delivered a significant address at the annual convention of the National Limestone Institute here in Washington.

In discussing the International Food and Nutrition Act, authored by Senator MCGOVERN and now pending in the Congress, he said:

All men can be winner of a war against want, just as we are real winners today from the war against domestic want which started in the Thirties to bring an end to the paradox of want and surpluses coexisting within the United States itself.

As a cosponsor of this bill, I call the attention of other Senators to his remarks, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAR THAT ALL CAN WIN

(Remarks of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, at the annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966)

For all of the decade I have spent in Washington I have been talking and writing about a war against want.

It is a real pleasure to talk to some of the warriors—to the men of an industry who have helped husband our soil resources and keep them productive both by supplying an essential mineral, calcium-carrying lime-

stone, and by defending the Federal program which has helped to increase limestone use from the 1- to 3-million-ton-level in the 1921-46 period to 27 million tons last year.

All Americans are indebted to you and your industry for your part in the job that has been done.

I know you have a direct interest in the agricultural conservation program. We all do. And we will all benefit if the application of limestone to our farmlands climbs to the 80 million tons annually which the agronomists tell us that we need. You would benefit. Farmers would benefit. The land would benefit. America would be strengthened for the great war against hunger which lies ahead.

Private enterprise—yours, the hybrid seed salesman's, the farm machinery and supply industry's, and the farmers'—has now admittedly made the difference between America's food abundance and the Communist bloc's conspicuous lag in agricultural development and ability to feed its own people. Russia is now trying to build some incentives into her system and stimulate some of the sort of enterprise found in America.

We also have an obligation to the Limestone Institute for the presence in Washington of your president, Bob Koch.

Bob is a genius, and I say that thoughtfully. I have long known him as a man of great organizational ability and as a great legislative strategist. Two or three months ago he produced an edition of your Limestone magazine so effective you received a well-deserved Freedom From Hunger Foundation Award. I can attest its effectiveness for I got a good many letters asking if I had seen it, or asking how to get a copy. Copies were also sent to me by a dozen people who wanted to be sure that I didn't miss it because they were themselves so impressed.

So Bob has proved himself an editor and publisher of great talent.

Last month, Bob and his staff almost single-handedly arranged an impressive organizational meeting the Committee on the World Food Crisis. No one else could have assembled such an outstanding group of national leadership people and run a meeting so smoothly and impressively in the short time he had. Thus far, I have found nothing that your president cannot handle in a distinguished way.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to you of him, as I have already expressed it to him.

Through your national office, this organization has already made a mighty contribution to efforts to awaken our country to what I am sure is the greatest challenge of our times. It is a challenge which involves not only our moral responsibilities as Christians to our fellow men, but also our national security and the possibility of bringing into existence a world at peace. At the same time, it offers us an opportunity for economic growth.

The world is faced with hunger and starvation on a scale never before known, unless we begin at once to plan for tomorrow's food needs, as well as to size population to what this planet can support. The food crises that are occurring this year in Russia, Red China, and India, resulting in food grain transactions of unprecedented size, are a very mild, pallid warning of what lies ahead.

The reality is that the Russia, China, and India emergencies have only tended to divert attention from even larger, chronic hunger and starvation in the world, which we have been taking for granted. Under so-called normal food supply conditions, want is far more extensive than generally realized.

Half a billion of the world's 3 billion people lack enough food. Another billion suffer from malnutrition, or lack of adequate proteins, vitamins and minerals in the foods

they eat. Three million children die each year from diseases induced by malnutrition. Countless human beings go through life permanently crippled physically, mentally, and emotionally because they did not have proper food in their formative years. The ever-present companions of malnutrition—lethargy, disease, and premature death—breed a vicious cycle of listless people, powerless to break out of their misery but capable of breeding children and multiplying misery.

The present prospect of this undernourished planet is that population will double in the next 35 years and stand at 6 billion human beings in the year 2000. World population growth is now about 2 percent a year.

The growth rate testifies to the miracles of modern medicine, but it is a miracle, upon us here and now, which mankind cannot manage unless we adopt policies and make adjustments with far greater speed and boldness than ever before in human history. Massive famines that will take the lives of hundreds of thousands of our fellow men will be upon us in another decade unless the planet's agricultural resources—both those of America and of the less-developed world—are brought to maximum production during that decade.

There is one thing certain: the paradox of America restricting production while tens of millions starve cannot continue any more than this Nation in the thirties could tolerate the paradox of extensive want, hunger, and death in the midst of surpluses.

Population control measures are on the way. But they will not be adopted overnight. There remain both social and scientific hurdles to be overcome. Control is unlikely to do a great deal about the anticipated 40-percent increase in world population in the 15 years just ahead, to 1980. That means another 1¼ billion mouths to feed and bodies to be supplied.

Heroic increases in world food supplies are needed now to alleviate want and prevent another generation of warped bodies, extending the problem of handicapped adults another generation. Our surpluses are all but gone. Our 1.4 billion bushel carryover of wheat in 1961 will have been halved next July 1, and is headed down toward 600 million or even 500 million bushels—less than an adequate security reserve. Feed grain carryover has been pulled down from 85 million tons to 57 million tons. Dairy products are already in short supply seasonally. We need to stimulate soybean production for commercial markets this year. We have a statistical surplus of cotton, but less than enough to decently and warmly clothe the people on earth today.

It will take large increases in food production in the years just ahead if the adjustment is to be made with food rather than by reduction of population through war, disease, starvation, and mass deaths.

This grim world outlook can be our greatest international opportunity if we are capable of a grand strategy in world affairs. We have two courses to choose between, now that Public Law 480, the food for peace law, is drawing to an end because of the disappearance of agricultural surpluses on which it is based.

We can treat the race between food and population as a continuing, inevitable human tragedy which is remote from us. We can announce our surpluses are gone and let children and adults die off in the less developed and less fortunate lands, concentrating on protecting our island of affluence in a sea of misery with halfway aid measures and the threat of massive nuclear retaliation. If we choose that course, we will be running the risk of a cataclysmic war which will leave even the survivors in a cauldron of radioactivity to meet an uncertain fate.

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

957

for these entrusted with national responsibilities, to review the manner in which they have carried out these responsibilities, to assess the situation and to plan adequate actions for the next stage.

This is why, today after over 200 days in the office entrusted to me by the directory as head of the Government and on the occasion which coincides with the end of the At Ty lunar year, I consider it my duty to appear before you, fellow citizens and comrades in arms, to draw, together with you, a year-end balance sheet and to define the objectives for the year ahead.

PART I

Dear fellow citizens and comrades in arms, before dealing with future objectives, we should of course glance back at the past and make a sincere review of past activities to determine what we have achieved and frankly acknowledge what we were unable to achieve and what still remains to be completed.

I am going to review the negative part first because what the Government has not done according to its wishes has always obsessed me.

Let me deal straight off with a minor problem but one which however is closely related to the daily life of the population in the capital and which has become a cause for criticism of the government: electricity.

It is, of course, a handicap to industrial and commercial enterprises, and an irritation for private citizens and the government alike, when so vital a commodity as electricity cannot be supplied. In many press conferences and communiques explanations have been given regarding the cause of the electricity shortage and the measures taken to solve it. Some deadlines for solution have been set. But notwithstanding this, the capital still remained short of electricity until the end of 1965.

It was only at the beginning of the year that the electricity cut was limited to nighttime only. Despite the efforts made by the government to help solve the shortage—efforts that yielded some results—the shortage which prevailed during the last 6 months was a stain which marred the picture of the government's achievements.

While this stain still remains to be removed, another has appeared: the bus transportation problem. You all know that problem. It has been a chronic disease. Many remedies have been tried to cure the disease but all of them failed. Finally, the government was compelled to remove the cause of the disease by allowing the bus management authority to wind up business and leave the place to another and sounder organization to run the company.

Outside of Saigon, the existing state of the interprovincial communications network is also a problem, but one which must be blamed totally on the war, not on technical or organizational defects. And the present war is chiefly one of sabotage directed by the enemy mainly against our infrastructure facilities: highways, bridges and so forth. Therefore, to solve the problem of lines of communication is conditional on the solution of this war of sabotage. Now that the war situation has begun to turn to our advantage, the improvement of the communications network seems realizable.

In the area of major concern is the economic problem. No government whatsoever could boast full success in its economic policy after only 6 months in power, especially when it inherits a chaotic situation which lasted for 2 years and which bore the aftermath of a period of 20 war years.

But not to have attained success does not mean failure. The tremendous effort and the achievements recorded will demonstrate this. However, as long as there is a large gap between wages and prices, as long as our people must strive so hard to find such items of prime necessity as milk, sugar and cloth, and so long as our fellow countrymen

have to wait long months before being able to buy a motorbike the present government has to admit shortcomings, as it has to make all-out effort to settle the whole problem or at least to reduce the numerous injustices which still abound in all classes of society.

In the list of shortcomings, we must acknowledge the absence of institutions planned in the provisional charter, which to date still fail to be realized: such as the High Economic and Social Council, and the High Council of Magistrates. We must also recognize that, due to the present circumstances, the government still is unable to create a favorable political climate. This leads to a report of what remains to be done.

These things of which I spoke were only part of the government's shortcomings.

There were naturally many others, as mentioned almost daily in the press and by the public and that I sincerely admit in order to draw therefrom valuable lessons.

Dear fellow citizens and comrades in arms, while considering these shortcomings from an impartial and objective viewpoint, we cannot, however, deny the achievements made by the government during the short period of time since it came to power.

In contrast to the earlier 6-month period, and contrary to pessimistic predictions by those malcontent politicians and especially by those ill omen tellers, we have achieved political stability, a key prerequisite if we are to win the present ideological war. The success in this can be ascribed to the spirit of comprehension and cooperation prevailing among all strata of the population and among all political and religious groups.

All of these were aware that the trend to division, to partisanship, and to mutual destruction in the national ranks are serious defects which can only result in hurting the people's fighting potential at a time when the Communists are increasing their war effort. Because of this achievement in national solidarity and unity of mind and action, our rear has been more consolidated than ever before, compared with what prevailed under previous postrevolution governments. It is also evident that this support for the frontline and the consolidation of the rear have taken place in an enthusiastic and stimulating atmosphere which has brought together the major sections of the population.

That is also the reason leading to the obvious improvement of the military situation, and that is also why the free world has shown its confidence in us with a great number of democratic nations giving full assistance in all fields to us. The most eloquent proof has been the participation in the fight, without any conditions, by the allied forces, who fight alongside their Vietnamese comrades in arms on all the battlefields. This has resulted in important military victories, making the situation better every day. If we were not cautious, we would say more and more optimistic. Without having to elaborate the difference compared to what it was 6 months ago it is clear for all to see.

Our military victories began immediately in the rainy season, the very monsoon season in which the Vietcong had boasted many times that they won the initiative in every battlefield. If this Communist propaganda made some lose their confidence and become pessimistic, the government can point to its victories in the present dry season as something more specific than propaganda.

Since last October, after the world-famed victories of Pleime, Ya Drang, and Chu Prong, where thousands of Communist bodies were left behind, Government forces, with the effective support of allied forces, successively won many other important battles: the Ba Ria ambush, the pursuit operation against the VC Dong Thap Regiment at My Tho, Bau Bang, Ben Cat, as well as the battles at Cau Ke, Cho Gao, Thach Tru, Lap Vo, Tam Ky, Long My, and so on. Everywhere, enemy

bodies were lying all over the battlefield along with huge quantities of weapons.

All this testifies to the valiant spirit and the combat tactics of the Government and allied forces. Of course, this fighting spirit can only endure if one has confidence in the Government and in the future of our Nation.

The point most worth mentioning in this present phase of our struggle is that no enemy position and no enemy stronghold can be considered safe, because all these have been smashed in repeated bombings and shellings.

In brief, in contrast with the military situation this month last year, the Government and allied troops have completely in hand the initiative of operations at every battlefield, and the tide of the war has turned in our favor.

Following the military victories, the Government has also scored many valuable successes in the diplomatic field. The Government has striven to restore the national prestige, the confidence, as well as the strengthening of cooperation and support, of the friendly countries in this anti-Communist struggle.

That is one reason why many high-level delegations from our country have made goodwill visits to neighboring countries, such as the delegation led by the Secretary General of the National Directory to the Philippines recently and the visits to the Republic of China, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, and Thailand.

The Vietnamese missions abroad also instructed their personnel to hold conferences and seminars at the universities, associations, press organizations, with student and religious and other groups to explain the aggressive plot of Communist North Vietnam, and the Vietnamese people's and Armed Forces' struggle.

Our diplomatic offensive has greatly diminished any prestige the Vietcong had. The most concrete proof of this is that the British Government has put aside a resolution submitted by a leftist parliamentary group and formally announced that it recognized only the lawful government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Countries friendly to us, especially those in the Afro-Asian bloc, which include a large majority of nonaligned countries that formerly paid little attention to our struggle for self-defense, have changed their attitude and now show good will and sympathy toward us through support for Vietnam at the Algiers conference.

At the United Nations General Assembly, many member nations have affirmed their support of the stand of the Republic of Vietnam. At present, nearly 40 free world countries are actively contributing to our struggle in one form or another and will continue their assistance until our final victory over the Communists and until peace and happiness are restored to the entire people.

Next comes the economic aspect. Though communication difficulties greatly affect the national economy the Government's efforts in regularizing the internal market have been as follows:

Rice supply: During the past 3 months more than 82,000 tons of rice have been supplied to the eastern provinces, the central highland, and midlands. Some 1,735 tons of paddy and 90 tons of rice have been transported from the Mekong delta to Saigon. Rice imported from the United States totaled more than 27,000 tons shipped to Da Nang and more than 16,000 shipped to Nha Trang. With more than 93,000 tons of imported rice, the Economy Department will have enough rice to provide for local needs and to set up reserves for the provinces.

During the past 3 months, 21,334 tons of sugar and 331,600 cases of condensed milk have been put on sale.

There was an increase in price and a shortage of rice and some other food in

September and October but now thanks to the Government's efforts, food is no longer short and prices are stable. For example, Saigon consumes daily from 800 to 1,000 pigs. The price of pork previously was high because the city received only 400 pigs a day. But now the supply has become regular and in the last month the city has received 2,000 pigs every day or twice the quantity it needs.

The price of pork has dropped accordingly. Since July 1965 the Government has spent \$47 million to import rice, condensed milk and wheat flour, the quantity of which largely exceeds local needs for the Lunar New Year.

To meet any emergency the Government has set up storage depots to stock needed goods such as rice. These include: two rice depots in Ba Xuyen and Bac Lieu, three in Da Nang, Qui Nhon and Nha Trang, eight depots for the cooperatives in the western provinces, six depots for the tobacco cooperative and other depots for cotton yarn and paper.

To supply other needed materiel for the population, the Government has provided 25 more million of U.S. dollars to import motorbikes, scooters, radios, sewing machines, and other goods. Meanwhile assistance from countries other than the United States have been used to import industrial equipment.

To cope with artificial shortages and excessive price increases, the establishment of large retail centers is being studied.

Our efforts to improve the standard of living and activities in the field of social welfare are also noteworthy:

Land reform: Thanks to the new land reform program, 3,158 farmers have been made landowners since September 1965. Of this total, 2,268 low-income farmers in 10 provinces were allotted cultivated land in accordance with ordinance 57. A further 758 families in seven provinces were allowed to work public-owned land and 132 families in one province were allotted cultivated land which was purchased from French nationals.

Further, by virtue of the October 8, 1965, decree, 227,629 families that were working on cultivating fallow land in the clearing and resettlement centers have been given ownership of 134,700 hectares of cultivated land.

Electrification of the rural areas: Three rural electrification pilot cooperatives were established in Tuyen Duc, An Giang, and Duc Tu (Bien Hoa) with the view of supplying power to the cooperative members at low prices. The Rural Electrification Cooperative Union was established on October 15, 1965, in order to push ahead the rural electrification program.

Workers' appropriation program: A total of 400 taxicabs and 200 tri-Lambrettas were imported in the first phase of the Government's program to sell these vehicles on an installment basis to drivers who used to rent their cars from others. A first lot drawing of such vehicles took place on January 8, 1966, in the capital. All the vehicles will be distributed by January 17. Other contingents of such vehicles will be imported by the Economy Department for redistribution.

Low-cost housing units: The Public Works and Communications Department built 554 single-story housing units at Vinh Hoi and Tan Qui Dong. Other construction projects such as road paving and drainage operations are underway at Thanh My Tay, Thanh Da and Phu Tho Hoa. Another building project, covering the construction of 1,000 housing units, at VN\$25,000 each for workers is under study. Payment for the homes will be made on a 10- to 20-year installment basis and no down payment will be required. At the same time, the Department also plans to buy up vacant lots and sell them on an installment basis to low-income families who wish to do their own building. Another noteworthy fact is

that the Government has cancelled the "villa" building project for certain civil servants which was initiated by previous governments.

Health: The Health Department made a tremendous effort to build in the capital as well as in various provinces, a dispensary, a psychiatric center, a leprosy center, a surgical section, four maternity clinics, and a farm for mentally ill persons. These efforts have been carried out, along with the training of rural health cadres. We have arranged the reception of foreign medical teams including a number of experts and quantities of materials and drugs.

Social welfare work: As of December 12, 1965, the Social Welfare Department granted a total of VN\$285,714,210 to anti-Red refugees throughout the country. Of the total number of refugees, 460,434 have been resettled. The Social Welfare Department also has enlarged the Thu Duc National Orphanage and built two new orphanages in Vinh Long and Binh Thuan at a total cost of VN\$12 million. Plans have also been drafted for the construction of 20 day nurseries and 12 other orphanages in 1966 at a total estimated cost of VN\$82 million.

All the regional social welfare organizations throughout the country have received financial assistance from the Social Welfare Department for further development. A beggar reformation center has been set up at Phu Binh in an effort to put an end to begging which must be eliminated in any modern society.

In the field of information, with the aim of bringing news to large numbers of people in the rural areas, more than 30 provincial newspapers have been published. During the past 6 months, the Chieu Hoi (open arms) program recorded more than 7,000 returnees who brought in nearly 1,000 weapons.

Television is one of the newest activities in our society. After a series of studies, on January 3, 1966 we signed an agreement with the American Government on television. At the end of this month television programs will be available here. One thousand TV sets will be installed in the heavily populated areas of the capital and in nearby provinces. A following shipment will bring another 1,500 sets to Vietnam.

In the field of culture and education, one can note the following points:

An education reform movement has been launched in order to help students make progress from the moral, intellectual and physical points of view. The movement also aims at giving the students a stronger sense of responsibility as citizens. This is an attempt to form a new generation of youth for the reconstruction of the country. Four pilot centers are now actively operating toward this end.

A large number of schools have been built to cope with our educational needs, such as the Viet Duc (Vietnamese-German) technical education and the craft and industry school at Thu Duc, the school for the deaf and dumb at Lai Thieu, three new primary schools in Thua Thien, Ham Tan, and Binh Tuy and so on. In addition to all this, 546 primary school noon classes which are very detrimental to the health of the children, have been abolished, and 224 new classrooms have been built for the pupils in the Saigon-Gia Dinh area.

The annual examinations at the primary and secondary education levels have been revised for the benefit of the students. The primary education examinations and those for the junior high school certificates will no longer be held, starting with this school year. The baccalaureate I system of examinations will also be abolished starting with the 1968-69 school year.

As another evidence of the government's efforts in the rural education field, outstanding students from low-income families

will be granted official scholarships, thus enabling worthy students to complete their secondary education.

A cultural institute is to be established with a view to promoting all the national cultural activities. The institute will be open to writers, artists, journalists, and to the public as well. A program aimed at improving arts and letters will be announced shortly and put into practice in the near future.

Administrative reforms are also being tackled by the government. An administrative reform committee has been established to study and to recommend all appropriate measures designed to increase the administrative efficiency of the government machinery. As a result of such reforms, close cooperation between the Administrative and Financial Inspection Directorate General on the one hand and the inspection divisions of the other departments on the other hand has been initiated. All the administrative abuses such as misuse of authority, bribery, misappropriation, etc., will be eliminated.

In other fields, the Government has done its best to successfully serve the people in accordance with scheduled programs which are scheduled but which I will not mention here.

The Government has strictly run its programs in line with what was announced 7 months ago. The outcome of the prosecution of such programs are modest but unquestionable and are decisive to the success of the social revolution. In fact, the steps which our society are taking have not merely started in another direction, they are already traveling in another direction. All those who directly contribute to the struggle for the emergence and the reconstruction of the fatherland are well treated and supported. All the low-income people who once suffered injustice under the old regime now are getting land of their own to plow or taxicabs of their own to drive. In the economic field, no complete control of consumer goods prices has been made by the Government as yet. But the normalization of the supply of such goods by the Government has been effected. This means that the Government is cutting off opportunities for the profiteers' malpractices by totally controlling the supply of the consumers' goods. In the military area the continuous victories on the battlefields have forced the enemy into a defensive position and he has to take recourse in terrorist acts.

Although these results have not yet entirely satisfied us, they do constitute reasons to strengthen our confidence in the final victory.

PART II

Dear fellow Vietnamese, dear comrades in arms, from the date of assumption of office by the war cabinet, the Government's policies and programs of action have been clarified on several occasions. Therefore, the major targets of the war cabinet could in no way be misunderstood by the people. The assessment of the home situation and the announcement of the major duties of the war cabinet during the inauguration ceremony of the Government on June 19, 1965, and the declaration of its 26-point program of action still constitute the guiding principles for governmental projects. In addition, on October 1, after 100 days of office, I made an amendment to the war cabinet's role so as to fit its programs of action more closely to the national requirements. On that occasion I also confirmed my standpoint on the national revolution and restoration of peace—a standpoint which the Government is perseveringly and determinately carrying out to respond to the situation.

Within the framework of such general policy of the Government, and on the basis of the results which I have reported, I would

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

959

like now, on behalf of the cabinet, to announce the main targets to be realized by the Government in 1966:

A. First target: To win the war—to pacify, and to reconstruct the rural areas

First of all, what do we really want?

Such a question posed to any Vietnamese concerned with the fate of his compatriots and the honor of the nation and the happiness of the people in this part of the world—which means the happiness of each individual and each family—gets this unique and unvarying answer: Decidedly, not to communism.

To such an answer, no additional comment is needed.

There is no answer more eloquent than the blood of thousands of combatants who have sacrificed themselves for the survival of the fatherland from the Red imperialists' invasion.

There is no reason stronger than the hardship endured by the Vietnamese combatants and civilians during the lifetime of one generation, the hardships of those who are determined to eradicate Communist ideology from this part of the world.

There is no evidence more concrete than the flow of anti-Red refugees who prefer leaving behind all that is so dear to them: homes, ricefields, villages, rather than live shamefully under Communists' tyranny.

We are determined not to be Communists.

Such is the unanimous determination, the slogan of the whole Vietnamese population, yesterday, today and tomorrow, and until the day the Communist threat is eliminated from this country.

But how do we get rid of this threat?

There is no other alternative to the solution than to defeat the Communists and to rout them from their strongholds. We must defeat the Communists and exterminate communism. Otherwise, the Communists will exterminate us and enslave our people from our generation to our offsprings' generation. No one can foresee when enslavement by Communists will end.

The present anti-Red struggle is a total one. Its battlefields are everywhere. But the main line of resistance is in the rural areas and that is where the struggle will be decided.

So the formula for such a struggle for the war Cabinet is: to defeat the Communists, to pacify and to reconstruct the rural areas.

Of course, such a formula is not a new discovery. All the former governments called for rural reforms, back to the countryside, and so on. The policy remains the same, from the so-called strategic hamlet program to the new life hamlet action program, to to win the hearts of the people and to remove the poisonous fish from the pure rural waters.

What about the results? There is no need to repeat the results.

The war Cabinet will not follow the path of the one which has failed. It is determined to do something for the rural areas, the areas which constitute the main and basic part of our Nation.

To attain this goal, one must have an objective and realistic view of the situation. In fact, after a victorious military operation, one may think that an area is automatically pacified. But a state of insecurity can quickly return to the area by a small number of the Vietcong who mix themselves in with innocent people.

Our viewpoint is not only to root out the Vietcong from the rural areas but also to root ourselves in the rural areas and this not only for some time, but forever.

But, how to put this concept into action?

The task of liberating national territory remains a heavy, but glorious, task of the Armed Forces. But, naturally the Armed Forces cannot be stationed forever in every hamlet and village, and on every portion of

the roads. For this reason, immediately after a successful military operation, an effective and well-organized group of cadres will arrive to exploit the advantages brought in by the military operation. They will carry out pacification work with their main task to be the rebuilding of a new life in rural areas. These cadres will immediately set up teams among the people to help them rebuild their homes and till their land. They will contact authorities responsible for reconstruction of social welfare facilities such as schools, dispensaries, maternity clinics and the like. To maintain and consolidate the security in the area, they will also rally and organize the local people.

This effective system of cadres will spread horizontally from hamlet to hamlet and vertically from hamlet to village and village to district and so on. This will constitute an intersupport position having the effect of an oil spot. This is the very key to the problem of pacification and rural reconstruction.

These conceptions and plan of the government will constitute the main work of the Vietnamese Government for this year. The Government is determined to mobilize every opportunity and every resource and make every effort to recover maximum control of our cherished population and our rural areas by the end of 1966.

B. The second goal is to stabilize the economic situation

Our second important goal in the new year is to stabilize the economic situation.

To draw up a correct economic policy, one must begin by assessing accurately the present economic situation in the country.

Do we have inflation or do we not?

If we take the word in its literal meaning—indiscriminately putting in circulation banknotes without maintaining proper gold and currency reserves—we do not have any inflation because we have sufficient gold reserves to meet any currency demands.

If we understand the word in its popular meaning, i.e. a too large and too rapid circulation of the currency, then we do have this thing called inflation. Why? The following five reasons will explain this situation:

1. For a long time, and particularly for the past few years, because of the increasing tempo of the war, the budget demands increased to meet the war situation. To an already deficit budget we have added more deficits because of the instability and successive changes in the national situation.

2. Due to increasing subversive Vietcong activities, the supply system has encountered many difficulties, many branches of production have slowed down.

3. A number of short-sighted businessmen, thinking only of their immediate interests, have indulged in speculation and hoarding, cornering the market in many items and disturbing the economic life of the people.

4. To stop the expansion of Red imperialism, 200,000 allied troops have come to Vietnam to fight on our side, with expenditures reaching 1 billion piasters a month. In addition to this are the amounts spent on construction.

These reasons are the direct causes of the increase in the volume of currency while goods and other necessities could not supply the demand, thus creating price increases.

We should introduce here a parenthesis: civil servants and employees in the private sector and other people who live on a fixed salary suffer the most from price spirals. At the same time, unemployment has completely disappeared, since services everywhere are paid at the highest rates ever seen. In brief, if there are some classes of people suffering from this situation, other classes have benefited and now have a higher living standard. This is an important change in the overall living standard of the Vietnamese society. It is too soon at present to estimate the effects.

Such is the real situation and the difficulties in the solving of the problems are enormous. I would like to report here a typical event.

When speaking about the increase in the volume of currency and the decrease in available goods, everyone sees that the simple solution is merely to import a large quantity of foreign goods to make up for the shortage in local goods.

Thus, in the last 3 months, the Government has released nearly \$200 million from the aid funds as well as the Government-owned foreign currency to import prime necessity goods. But the problem is not that simple.

If you want to import goods, you have not only to pay for them, but also you have to hire ships to transport them and provide docks for landing them.

The commercial port of Saigon can only receive a maximum of 200,000 tons a year. With the present American aid program, the volume of imported goods already exceeds more than double this figure, not counting military materiel.

Thus, with the Government's utmost effort and with the help of the most eminent experts, it still needs a minimum period of several months to enlarge the landing piers and to construct new ones. This is the work the Government is urgently carrying out at Thu Thiem, an islet on Thu Duc River, and at Vung Tau, Cam Ranh, Qui Nhon, and Da Nang, so as to complete in a few months an emergency plan.

This plan includes any urgent and reasonable measures concerning financial, currency, and economic fields which will converge together to the important goal of maintaining the purchasing power of the plaster, arrest price increases, and provide the population with all the prime necessities.

On the one hand, the Government will strictly implement a policy of thrift and economy in its agencies, and reduce the national budget's expenditures to their minimum, despite the increase in military expenses.

The decision to reduce the expenditures down to \$55 billion and the decision to give priority in the national budget to rural reconstruction, and to construction of schools and hospitals was a basic element in discussion with the U.S. Government on the aid program. These decisions led to an increase of U.S. aid this year to at least twice the amount of U.S. aid last year.

On the other hand, the Government will strive to increase national resources, mostly its revenues by improving tax-collecting methods. In this respect, I am convinced that our compatriots of all social strata not only are eager to fulfill their duties toward the national budget, but also heartfully contribute to any urgently needed national requirements.

The tax system is under reexamination with new standards on social equity, so as to enable those circles who were enriched greatly due to the war situation to have the opportunity to contribute more than other laboring and needy people. Concerning those who live on their monthly salary, the Government will carry out every logical and complete supply system for their benefit.

In the meantime, all Government credit and tax agencies will give every assistance to the establishment or development of all useful branches of business. The Government is planning to expand public and semi-public enterprises to enable Vietnamese capital to participate to a greater degree.

Therefore, the savings can be used productively. Investments for increasing production will replace passive holding or illegal trade speculation, and foreign currency blackmarketing, which the Government is determined to eradicate.

I would like to warn once again all those blindfolded profiteers who hoard goods for

speculation and provoke price hikes; they will go bankrupt, because in the days to come, with the increase in foreign aid, imported goods will flow into the local markets. Adequate measures and procedures will be adopted to enable an abundant and rapid import of goods.

Concerning the consumers, I would like to call your attention to this fact: Every delay in the supplies and the temporary shortage of goods should be considered normal in a protracted war. So I ask you to avoid rushing into crowded shops to buy some temporarily short product. This only benefits dishonest dealers, pushes forward the speed of the money circulation and thus increases the pressure of inflation.

C. Our third goal: To build democracy

The third goal, building democracy, is as urgent and important as the two previous ones. I would like to clarify once more—to be sure that no one misunderstands the present government's goal and policy: because of the need in this historic phase, and conscious of their responsibilities toward the national destiny, the armed forces have assumed power, not with the intention of clinging to it, but to create the necessary conditions for setting up a genuine democracy that will answer the aspirations of the entire people and the goal of our nation's long war which has been with us since the French domination to present.

My viewpoint in this problem has not originated from my subjective conception but from an objective situation of the 2-year period following the November 1, 1963, events. Two years which saw the profound division of the people, the decomposition of our society, the internal subversion, along with a war that reached its highest intensity—all this caused a loss of confidence in this part of land, increased the people's suspicion, and sowed confusion among them. No one had confidence in anything and every theory, policy, or program submitted was regarded with distrust and cynicism.

In pure theory, democracy is the only factor which can defeat communism; if there is no democracy we lose the reason for our struggle, let alone the means of victory.

A genuine concept of democracy, however, should be based on the true situation of the country, the real circumstances of the society, the political maturity level of the population and, in this case, the subversive war being waged by the Communists.

In fact, in these 2 years, there was no basic document which could serve as a basis for building democracy. A provisional convention which was in effect no longer than 3 months was violated, amended, and some months later, completely buried, only to be replaced by what was called the Vung Tau Charter. This charter had been the cause of a troubled, dark period before a civilian government came into being with a provisional charter. But the fate of this document was no different from that of its predecessors. Now, with the National Leadership Committee, we have a convention, but this is no more than a temporary statute which comes from the Government, not from the people.

When one speaks of democracy, everything should come from the base that is the people—the entire people, or at least the majority of them—and not dictated from the Government and forced on the people.

A democratic regime should begin with a democratic constitution. But a constitution is not the work of a few days, and also it is not an experiment in a laboratory. Thus, the main point of the problem is to build democracy.

Without such a basic medium, a constitution, no matter how ideal, will be wilt and fade away, if it is not torn up by the uprisings.

However, I do not mean that this Government will use the state of war, or play up

anticommunism or use the present condition of the nation, to restrict democratization. This Government has made up its mind to proceed with democratization, slowly but determinedly by training the people for their responsibilities and their interests, by helping the social organizations and political parties find ways and means to step up their activities and strengthen their positions. Thus will such organizations and parties lend a successful hand to the common performance of the national duties in the future. This Government has also made up its mind to drop demagoguery and to deny any confused, shortsighted and blind democratization which will push the whole nation into chaos.

With such a philosophy, we move on our way toward progress with the following:

1. A democracy building council will be set up after the lunar new year. Upon formation, such a council will propose a draft constitution in the near future.

2. This draft constitution will serve as the main topic of discussion for seminars to be held throughout the country. Invited to participate in such seminars will be city and provincial councilmen, members of political parties, trade-union members, and students. So all the pros and cons of the matter concerned will be aired and recorded. Thus the preparation of the future constitution will be the preoccupation of the whole people, not of just a minority.

3. Once these seminars are launched, the Democracy Building Council will collect and consolidate the opinions and ideas of the participants and arrive at a consensus. The council will then amalgamate the various points into a document to be voted upon in a popular referendum. The referendum will be held next October.

4. After the people's opinions seminars have decided on a particular constitution, that constitution will serve as the basis of our democratic regime and will be officially proclaimed next November.

Those who wonder why we don't elect a constitutional assembly like many other countries have to look straight at the present war situation with its difficulties, complexities, and tricks, to find the answer.

The situation of our country is not like any other, so why take after other countries? We have to establish a constitution which fits our nation.

5. When we have the people's opinions on the constitution, we will prepare for real democratic elections in 1967. With these elections, we will have legislative services, according to the people's will, and come back to the regular government elected by the people.

While accomplishing these objectives we naturally also have to increase our efforts in the war and in the rural reconstruction program, in order to recover the Vietcong-controlled areas and help the anti-Communist refugees. The elections will only have meaning and value if security is assured and the citizens vote in large numbers. This is one reason why we are choosing a gradual and stable solution for the establishment of our democracy.

Besides, it is a reality which everyone has to accept, to be patient and confident, to prepare for the next step. As for the Government, it will carry out its responsibilities in these tasks and provide the organizations and parties with appropriate opportunities and conditions to reach a mature and superior level, to assure the future of the nation. The organizations and the parties themselves will—to be realistic—will review their ranks, reorganize themselves, form new cadres, and reinforce their real strength and prestige to assure themselves of the people's and authorities' confidence.

On this point, I would like to add that, though the present Government may still be awkward and inexperienced, there is no doubt

of its good will in collaborating with organizations, parties, and individuals who wholeheartedly want to lay the foundation for our future true democracy.

This completes the report on the objectives of the Government's program.

On this occasion, I deem it my duty to point out the traditional ideal and determination of the Vietnamese people which is to always cherish and seek peace but only a peace which will guarantee its freedom, independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. Any other form of peace which fails to provide these guarantees, would only be a lure into slavery and one which the Vietnamese people, with their clear-sightedness and courage, would crush down in order to proceed toward a genuine and realistic peace.

For those who still nurture doubts about this issue, I would say to them: our concept of peace is very simple. We have not provoked war, we have not declared war. The present war is an invasion from outside our country and one which at the outset was disguised as an internal struggle. But the disguise has been removed for a long time and the invader has uncovered himself. Now, it is up to the invaders from outside and his subversive henchmen within our country to end the invasion and subversion. Then peace would at once return to this part of the country. Thus we would end the concern of so many nations large and small and of so many statesmen the world over. If the invaders, acting like a blind force, cannot restrain themselves, then it would be our duty and the duty of all those peace-loving people to combine efforts to contain their ambition. Otherwise, the last resort would be to "outlaw them as peace saboteurs" in this peace-loving and freedom-loving part of this country.

I deem it my duty also to express the sincere gratitude of all our people to all the countries and international organizations and statesmen, as well as to all religious leaders, especially Pope Paul VI, who have demonstrated great concern over the plight of the Vietnamese people. I further want to insist that peace is workable only if it can guarantee national independence as well as the people's freedom of thought and human dignity.

I also want to associate all our fellow citizens and comrades-in-arms to the acknowledgement that under whatever circumstances, we should ourselves be responsible for our own destiny. No other nation is qualified and able to decide on our destiny, independently of our own will. For reasons of international solidarity, we have accepted, and are grateful for the moral and material, military and economic, assistance from the friendly countries. But never can we tolerate any interference harmful to our national sovereignty or any decision at variance with our people's aspirations.

Fellow citizens, comrades in arms, now I have spoken out all my feelings, my remarks and my observations and I have reported on the objectives of both the National Directory and the war Cabinet from the period just ended to the next one.

Despite the clamor of war roaring around us, despite the noisy provocations hurled by our enemy to discourage us, despite differences of view touched off by certain people, whether responsible or not, we are determined to hold unflinchingly to our spirit, to endure suffering with great patience, to pursue tenaciously the struggle for national salvation and reconstruction with the purpose of defeating the Communists and bringing back peace to the fatherland. We will prevail in our present national plight in order to bring back democracy, prosperity and happiness to our people.

With this strong belief and decision, I sincerely urge all our compatriots without distinction of class, religion, social stratum group, or party to clearly assist in the effort

January 24, 1966

to sweep aside all friction, confrontation, or jealousy of an individual or communal nature and devote all their efforts and will to the future reconstruction of the fatherland and nation.

When the nation is faltering, when the country is suffering destruction and partition, most of our families will suffer estrangement, separation, misery, and the loss of loved ones.

If there are some classes of our society which are privileged, this is just a minority in the different classes of the national community.

The war situation, along with disorder, oppression and the struggle for survival and for progress have created social injustices, hampered the love of the nation and of mankind, and even has caused that love to be forgotten.

In the face of this state of affairs, I can only make a sincere appeal to every strata of society and to all of our compatriots to share the misfortune and to help the families who have been unfortunate in this national catastrophe. I also urge them to look straight at the situation created by the subversion, the mourning, and the war, in order to come to the assistance of our poor compatriots by sacrificing to a certain extent our own interests.

Only with this can one hope to reduce social injustices, to restore the love for our fellow creatures, so that we may advance toward the reconstruction of this country.

The international situation is now going through tremendous changes which will see either the upsurge or the decline of our people. The period that lies ahead will be a decisive one as far as the salvation and reconstruction of this beloved land of ours is concerned.

We will have opportunities to quickly refill the gaps, the delays, and the waste of time which occurred during the past 2 years.

We should remain united in mind and spirit so that we may try to take advantage of these opportunities. We alone can save ourselves. We can not stay idle waiting for assistance from others.

I am of the opinion that those of us who are still alive have as had those who have died, the duty of contributing to the task of rebuilding, renovating, and developing this land to help it become stronger and to help it progress.

This is our heritage and the heritage of our successive generations.

I resolutely have confidence in the clear-minded recognition and of the reasonable choice of all fellow countrymen as well as of our fellow combatants.

I salute my fellow countrymen and fellow combatants.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, since my duties as presiding officer of the Senate last Thursday kept me from speaking on H.R. 8126, the bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law before it was passed by the Senate, I would like to take a moment now to note for the record, my strong support for this long overdue reform and my pleasure at its passage.

Madam President, the concept of minimum wage legislation for the District of Columbia is not new. Congress first enacted a District of Columbia minimum wage law in 1918. That law was a pioneer in the minimum wage field.

But as the decades have passed, that law stood still. Its coverage was too restrictive and its provisions were too rigid to meet the needs of the National Capital.

Although many workers in the District were protected by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, more than 200,000 employees who work in the District of Columbia were not protected by any minimum wage law.

Indeed, one of the most glaring defects of the 1918 law was that it covered only female and children employees. It gave no protection to men at all. Nor did it cover domestic workers.

Who needs minimum wage protection? Do the lawyers, doctors, architects and other professional people have to worry about earning the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage the bill the Senate passed last Thursday authorizes? Do organized and skilled employees work for less than \$1.25 an hour?

No, the people who directly benefit from minimum wage legislation and the people who need it most are the unskilled workers whose labor contributes so greatly to the effective functioning of society, but whose skills are so slight or whose employment is so unstable that they have little power to organize and no ability to bargain for a decent wage.

The dishwashers, the waiters, the janitors, the car parkers, the household maids, and the thousands of others who provide many of the services which make life easier and more pleasant for all of us, most often find that society is willing to accept their labor, but not willing to see that they are paid a living wage.

In preparing the minimum wage bill we passed Thursday, the Senate District Committee discovered too many cases like that of a restaurant kitchen worker here in the District who works 48 hours a week and gets only \$12.50 a week and two meals a day for his pay. The committee discovered an apartment house maintenance man paid \$35.40 for a 40-hour week and a parking lot attendant paid 45 cents an hour.

We cannot tolerate these incredible conditions anywhere in the country, and especially not in the Capital.

H.R. 8126, as amended and passed by the Senate, is a reasonable response to the pressing problem of providing a minimum living wage for thousands of workers in the District of Columbia.

By extending the minimum wage to men, as well as women and children, in the District, the bill will eliminate conditions such as those found to exist in one upholstery shop, where a man was paid 90 cents an hour for doing the same work women do in the same shop for \$1.10 an hour.

By requiring payment of time and a half for overtime, the bill will reduce the excessive hours worked in many District of Columbia places of business and spreading the number of jobs available.

By extending the minimum wage to domestic workers in the District of Columbia for the first time, the bill will guarantee a decent wage for the many women who labor in others' homes to provide or supplement a bare subsistence income for their families.

All this bill does is to make sure that District of Columbia workers receive at least the national minimum wage for their labors. All this bill basically provides is that for a 40-hour week, 52

weeks a year, a worker should receive at least \$2,600.

A reasonable minimum wage for the workers of the District of Columbia will help hold families together, help contain welfare costs, and help provide a decent opportunity for family dignity. A decent minimum wage will generate increased purchasing power for District of Columbia businesses, thereby improving economic conditions generally, and providing greater employment opportunity.

But an equally compelling reason for enacting this District of Columbia minimum wage bill is that the human cost of a lower minimum wage is simply too high to bear. When the father of a family cannot make enough to feed and clothe his family, the community cost is increased crime and delinquency, worsened slums and rising welfare expenses is intolerable by the cost to our conscience of standing by while fellow citizens are exploited by a cynical and heartless wage slavery.

This revision of the District of Columbia minimum wage law was long overdue. It was necessary. It was right.

PRAISE FOR JACK VAUGHN AND LINCOLN GORDON

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President "A Good Reshuffle"—that is what the New York Times called the change which brought Jack Vaughn in as Director of the Peace Corps and Lincoln Gordon to take his place as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. Knowing them both, I can say "amen" to the praise they have both received.

Jack Vaughn was in on the ground floor of the Peace Corps. He was there from the first, and was one of those who kept its programs close to the earth. He has emphasized a community development approach by which corpsmen act as catalysts, cheerleaders, gadflies, and promoters for self-help projects which begin when the local people identify their needs. When he came to the Peace Corps, there were 123 volunteers in Latin America. When he left to become Ambassador to Panama, there were 3,000. I have seen them at work in the urban slums and destitute backlands of Brazil, and I can testify that they are doing a praiseworthy job.

It was in Brazil, where he has served as our Ambassador, that I first met Lincoln Gordon. I endorse the appraisal of him made by the New York Times. Their editorial of January 19 said:

The appointment of Lincoln Gordon as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America brings to that difficult assignment a man with penetrating judgment and a wealth of useful experience as an economist, Government official, and diplomat.

He has been an enthusiastic Ambassador to Brazil, providing that country with sensible economic advice and trying tactfully to steer its present military regime toward a democratic solution of its difficulties. Mr. Gordon understands what the Alliance for Progress is all about and can be depended upon to give it resolute support.

The Washington Evening Star said of Jack Vaughn:

(He) was doing a remarkable job as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American

Affairs and U.S. coordinator of the Alliance * * *. His selection does assure the Peace Corps of an able, imaginative Director.

Mr. President, both men promise well. We have reason for reassurance in their selection.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

A GOOD RESHUFFLE

Whether his directorship of the poverty program enhances or detracts from his reputation in the future, Sargent Shriver's service with the Peace Corps has marked him as an effective idealist.

The idea for the Peace Corps was first broached by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY in the Senate and Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, in the House and was later taken up by President Kennedy; but it was Mr. Shriver who transformed an exciting idea into a convincing success. His zest and energy have helped thousands of volunteers, young and old, cut through the deadly smog of cynicism that tends to envelop foreign policy and to reach the poignant human realities that lie behind today's crises.

Jack Hood Vaughn, who now takes over the leadership of the Peace Corps, is doubtless happy to be leaving the State Department, where he has been Assistant Secretary for Latin America. As an outsider with an academic background, he has been sandwiched between the career Foreign Service officers below him and the dominating personality of Under Secretary Thomas C. Mann above him.

He had barely assumed office a year ago when the Dominican crisis erupted. Mr. Vaughn has loyally defended administration actions in that crisis, but the evidence suggests that he was a bystander, as President Johnson and Under Secretary Mann did most of the policymaking. Back in the Peace Corps, where he previously served as Latin American chief, Mr. Vaughn can deploy his talents in a line of work totally congenial to him.

The appointment of Lincoln Gordon as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America brings to that difficult assignment a man with penetrating judgment and a wealth of useful experience as an economist, Government official, and diplomat. He has been an enthusiastic Ambassador to Brazil, providing that country with sensible economic advice and trying tactfully to steer its present military regime toward a democratic solution of its difficulties. Mr. Gordon understands what the Alliance for Progress is all about and can be depended upon to give it resolute support. If any man can reassert the full authority of the Assistant Secretary as chief policymaker for Latin America in the bureaucratic jungles of Washington, Mr. Gordon is the man.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1966]

GUIDING FOR BATTLE

The White House showed good judgment in giving the war on poverty its first full-time administrator. This is the most ambitious of all the domestic programs created by the Johnson administration—and, at the moment, the most vulnerable. The Republicans are talking of scandals in the anti-poverty war that will be revealed in due course. And such extravagant failures as New York City's Hareyou-Act program have left the public skeptical of the whole operation. Relieved of his Peace Corps job, Mr. Shriver still will have his hands full defend-

ing and guiding what has become a prime target of congressional criticism.

The White House had to raid the State Department to find a Peace Corps Director—and the Alliance for Progress seems to be the loser. We agree with Representative SELDEN, chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, that Jack Hood Vaughn was doing a remarkable job as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs and United States coordinator of the alliance. It is even possible that Vaughn's present tasks are a good deal more important than anything he could do as Peace Corps Director. But his selection does assure the Peace Corps of an able, imaginative director—leaving Sargent Shriver free to wage the bigger war at home.

SAGA OF THE SEA

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, on November 26, 1965, the SS *Oduna*, battered by high seas and 50-mile-an-hour winds, ran aground between rocks and a high cliff on Unimak Island, off western Alaska.

The angle of the ship made it impossible to lower lifeboats. Thus the scene was set for another great saga of the sea. In the true tradition of those that go down to the sea in ships, courageous attempts to take the men off the SS *Oduna* were successful. The entire crew of 37 was rescued.

The ship, on a regular run from Adak to Seattle, was owned by the Alaska Steamship Co. The company's agent in Kodiak submitted a report on the crew. The report is fascinating reading. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, those reading the report will learn of the courageous actions of four members of the crew of the MV *Adeline Foss*, a Seattle-based tug which sped to the stricken ship on receiving its SOS.

Weather conditions made it impossible to approach the *Oduna* from the sea or the air. Military helicopters sent to the scene were forced to wait for a turn in the weather.

However, the *Adeline Foss* crewmen did not wait. A party consisting of 1st Mate W. D. Thompson and Seamen Russ Christensen, Larry Ostby, and Ted Snider, managed to land on Unimak Island. After making their way down the cliff they successfully set up a breeches buoy line and brought 19 members of the *Oduna* safely to shore. At that point, the weather improved and the rescue was completed by helicopter.

A report of the rescue operation has been submitted to the Merchant Marine Awards Committee for consideration of possible awards for the four men of the *Adeline Foss*.

Special mention must be made of the efforts of Air Force Capt. Gerald Belanger and his helicopter crew, which completed the rescue. Describing the work of these men, the captain of the *Oduna* said:

What he did is beyond words. We owe a great deal to him.

And finally, words of praise, and thanks should go to all the units, military and civilian, which were alerted and ready to take part in the rescue operations if needed.

Madam President, the story of the rescue of the crew of the *Oduna* indeed belongs among the great stories about those who go down to the sea in ships.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT ON THE SS "ODUNA"

The tragic ending of this voyage of SS *Oduna* under the sheer 700-foot cliffs of Ikatan Peninsula, Alaska, can only be tempered by the successful rescue of all 37 crewmen aboard in spite of battering seas and 50-knot wind conditions.

At 0655 November 26 we were notified of the *Oduna's* distress by Capt. R. E. Emerson, commanding officer, U.S. Coast Guard Air Station, Kodiak, with the terse information that she was aground, breaking up, and safety of the crew was deemed to be in extreme danger. Our office staff was alerted and reported for duty immediately. The facilities of Alaska Communication System were also notified and placed in full emergency status by their Kodiak commanding officer, M. Sgt. Gordon Wells, which subsequently contributed immeasurably to the successful communications network for the ensuing rescue operations.

On my arrival at the Kodiak Coast Guard Rescue Center at 0735, it was learned that the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Storis* and one of their Albatross aircraft, both based at Kodiak, were already en route to the scene, and intense operations were in progress for the dispatch of other vessels and aircraft. Kodiak Rescue Center was in full charge of all rescue operations, and the facilities of related commands in the Alaska Sea Frontier and on the mainland were made available as required. The nearest suitable helicopter was dispatched from the Air Force at King Salmon. The Air Force also supplied a C-130 transport aircraft from Elmendorf to move a detachment of Army mountain troops from Fort Richardson which were deemed necessary in the event it became appropriate to perform a rescue from the beach cliff area. Another U.S. Coast Guard Albatross was dispatched from Kodiak with additional equipment and personnel, including Lt. Comdr. John Hancock, U.S. Coast Guard, who was directed to assume mission command of all rescue forces on arrival at Cold Bay.

Commercial marine units also responded to the distress call. The nearby tug *Adeline Foss* quickly anchored her tow in a cove near the area and proceeded to *Oduna*. A Japanese vessel also responded, *Taiyo Saru No. 82*, and permission was obtained from the Navy to place a Japanese landing party on the beach should it be necessary before arrival of the Army mountain troops. The fisheries research vessel *Reed*, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife vessel U.S.S. *Pribiloff*, operating in the Dutch Harbor area, were also dispatched to the scene.

By 0900 rescue operations had assumed massive proportions. Weather conditions at the scene did not abate, and were reported to worsen. A Reeve Aleutian Airways Goose, based at Cold Bay, managed a hazardous flight to position of *Oduna*, and resulting reports were indeed grim. Seas were breaking over the stranded vessel, and 50- to 60-knot wind conditions prevailed.

We waited for arrival of rescue units. By 1100 both the *Adeline Foss* and the Japanese vessel reported any attempted approach to *Oduna* was impossible by sea. Rocks offshore and on both sides of the stranded vessel prevented any close approach, as well as any launching of the *Oduna's* lifeboats.

The first Albatross from Kodiak arrived at the scene at 1145 and the helicopter from

cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail—its roof may shake—the wind may blow through it—the storm may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter—all his force dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.”¹⁵

THE NEW YORK TIMES AND JAMES RESTON ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, some of the most perceptive writing on the Vietnam war has been done by the editorial staff of the New York Times and its distinguished columnist, Mr. James Reston.

I ask unanimous consent that two important editorials published in the Times of January 21 and 23, together with columns by Mr. Reston of the same dates, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

TALKS WITH THE VIETCONG

Secretary General Thant's formula for an interim broadening of the Saigon government, to "take over the responsibility" of organizing self-determination in South Vietnam after the war, points to the heart of the problem of achieving a peaceful settlement. Despite Secretary Rusk's negative reaction to U Thant's suggestion and his almost exclusive emphasis on Hanoi, somehow a way must be found to get talks going between the South Vietnamese factions that are doing the bulk of the fighting on the ground.

President Johnson's plan for free elections, after a cease-fire, is itself a means of achieving a representative administration in Saigon prior to American withdrawal. In a recent statement by Ambassador Bohlen, the United States has indicated that it would accept the results of such an election even if it returned a dominant Communist faction. But the real issue is how the elections are to be organized.

Essentially, this is a question of the kind of interim government that will preside over the country, under international supervision, during the electoral campaign. The electoral campaign itself can only follow a cease-fire. But a cease-fire is likely to be achieved only after an agreement on the makeup of an interim government.

Proposals often have been made—including one by the United Nations—Secretariat after the fall of Dien in 1963—that neutralist South Vietnamese leaders resident in Paris be brought home to form a new government and mediate between the warring factions. Talks between the generals ruling in Saigon and the Vietcong leadership—either directly or through intermediaries initially—would be another possible approach. There have been hints that the Vietcong would welcome the independence from Hanoi that such contacts might encourage.

The intransigent attitude of Air Vice Marshal Ky, the present Saigon Premier, does not necessarily rule out such talks. There have been repeated rumors in the past of contacts with the Vietcong on the part of South Vietnamese officers, Buddhist leaders, businessmen, and intellectuals. There would be little difficulty in finding intermediaries if the United States were prepared to encourage such exchanges. The aim of such talks could be to form either a neutral administration or a coalition in which the South Vietnamese Army, the Vietcong, the

Buddhists, the Catholics, the Cao Dai, and other political elements would participate.

The attraction of such an approach has been increased by the numerous setbacks Communist China has suffered during the past year in projecting its influence beyond its borders from Indochina to Africa. Most of its programs of expansion or subversion have either failed or have been deflated.

The result, as Times Correspondent Seymour Topping reported the other day, has been to create an opportunity for the United States to deal with the war in Vietnam no longer on the basis of determining "the form or ideology of the Vietnamese nation, but the reestablishment in southeast Asia of peace, order and respect for borders." A Vietnam, independent from China, that respected the borders of its neighbors would be a Vietnam contained—and separated from the rest of southeast Asia by the neutral buffer states of Laos and Cambodia.

The most orderly way to deal with the whole problem would be another Geneva conference similar to that on Laos in 1962. That conference brought together the five great powers, the Indochina states and factions, the neighboring nations of southeast Asia and the countries which comprise the International Control Commission, India, Poland and Canada. The best method to clear the way for such a conference might well be a beginning of efforts to broaden the Saigon Government—a move that might also stimulate Hanoi's interest in getting into the negotiating act.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Failure of the Johnson peace offensive thus far to bring about formal negotiations with Hanoi inescapably raises the question: what course should the United States now follow?

Much depends on Washington's evaluation of Hanoi's ambiguous public and private replies and on the official estimate of how long it is safe to keep the bombers grounded. Is Hanoi holding out for concessions? Or is Hanoi seeking to avoid a conference out of the conviction that the United States will get tired and withdraw? President Johnson expressed the latter belief yesterday. But his conclusion from this remains unclear, since he also said: "The door of peace must be kept wide open."

Many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese Army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is the fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year.

The decisive new element has been the ninefold build-up of American troops in South Vietnam to a strength of about 190,000. South Vietnamese armed forces, including militia and police, now exceed 635,000. With South Korean, New Zealand, and Australian units, there are upward of 850,000 men in the field. And the backing of American air and naval strength gives these forces devastating firepower and unparalleled mobility.

This buildup, in the words of President Johnson's state of the Union message, has put the enemy on notice that time is no longer on his side and that a Vietcong victory now is out of reach.

Meanwhile, it has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table. The bombing did force North Vietnam to turn from Peiping to Moscow for antiaircraft missiles and, even more important, for massive economic and technical aid. But this unexpected dividend

argues for a continued suspension of the bombing, rather than for its resumption.

As White House security adviser McGeorge Bundy recently observed: "It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement." And Moscow has also made it clear that peace efforts cannot be carried on while North Vietnam is being bombed.

The critical decision that confronts President Johnson, therefore, is not whether to resume the early bombing of the North—which even Republican leaders no longer press—but how to conduct the war in the South while continuing the probes for peace. The ground and air war in South Vietnam undoubtedly will resume fully after the Lunar New Year truce. What the President now must decide is whether to escalate that war in the south to a wholly new level by yielding to military requests for a doubling of American forces. Such a move would finally convert the struggle from a Vietnamese conflict into an American war against Asians.

A further large-scale buildup would not end the military stalemate in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration of additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

At present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice, not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

WASHINGTON: WHAT GREAT DEBATE?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The process of debate in Washington, even on so solemn a business as risking war with a quarter of the human race, is an astonishing and depressing business.

No capital ever talked so much about "great debates" or had so few of them. The Senate has not been performing its constitutional function of "advise and consent" on the critical issues of foreign affairs during the pause in the war. It has been tugging and hauling on the President in a series of disjointed and unconnected statements, speeches, and television remarks, most of them made outside the Senate Chamber.

The opposition party did not launch a debate on the President's state of the Union message. It put on a television show featuring Senator DRAXSEN and Representative FORD in a recitation which differed wildly from most of the things they have said about the war in the past.

CHAOS IN THE CORRIDORS

Secretary of Defense McNamara went before the Senate Armed Services Committee today and when he and the Senators emerged from the privacy of the committee chamber the scene was about as orderly as the end of a professional football game.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia told the crowding reporters that the general tone of McNamara's private remarks was that time was running out on the peace offensive. "Never even mentioned it," the Secretary said later.

No doubt the discussion inside the committee room was better, but ever since the start of the peace offensive the public statements have been a babble of disconnected shouts. One day a general comes back from Vietnam and calls for a resumption of the bombing in North Vietnam. The next a Senator offers his opinion that escalating the war now would be sheer madness.

¹⁵ 15 Hansard, Parliament History of England 1307 (1753-1765).

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

939

empts first-class mail from the levy powers of the IRS.²²

While the officials of most departments have ultimately extended cooperation and pledges to remedy existing situations, no such action has been taken by the FDA officials. No new regulations or controls, or even investigations, have occurred. However, this situation may be improved by new legislation currently under study that would make the FDA a multimembered commission with definite time limitations on tenure and the imposition of other restrictions on the commission members. In this way new thinking and a broader perspective can be introduced to aid the fair, efficient, and effective administration of the drug laws.

The very compilation of the record of the hearings is valuable. It documents the dangers inherent when the bureaucrats become too impervious and too insulated from criticism or challenge. Violation of laws, intimidation, and harassment have been proven. Disregard and ignorance of constitutional rights have been brought before the public and Congress. All of this will set the basis for future comprehensive legislation.

The Commissioner of the IRS has pledged that he will conduct his own investigation and report fully to the public and Congress. Already, new orders have been issued that will aid in controlling the overzealousness of his agents.²³

On July 15, 1965, the President publicly reaffirmed his ban on wiretapping and praised the efforts of the subcommittee as in the public interest.

With this record of achievement, the future should promise that more definite steps will be more easily taken to get to the heart of the problem of protecting privacy.

Legislation and review

The intention of the subcommittee is to continue the investigation until a complete picture is developed. This may take some time. However, the record is sufficient to give some general direction that future legislation should follow.

Initially, a comprehensive code regulating investigative techniques involving invasions of privacy presents a feasible means to remedy the existing violations and guard against future infringements. This code would attempt a broad definition of the right to privacy and the policy of Congress that such a right should be fully protected.

Wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping could either be banned outright or limited to specific urgent needs such as national defense, national security, or the investigation of major crimes.²⁴ Criminal and civil penalties would be imposed for violation of these rights. In addition the code would protect against intimidation or harassment by Federal agents.

Presently, there exist criminal statutes outlawing deliberate violations of certain con-

stitutional rights of citizens.²⁵ However, these have been either ignored or only partially enforced. There is need for expansion and effective enforcement of these laws.

Further possible legislation which could be considered separately by Congress or incorporated into the code would set forth a code of conduct for Federal agents, with appropriate penalties for its violation. In addition specific requirements as to the education of agents in the constitutional rights of citizens could be provided.

It is believed that while most agents have had the legal principles pertaining to search and seizure²⁶ made available to them, this isolated, microscopic information is inadequate. Further and more comprehensive education is needed in the purpose and meaning, not only of the fourth amendment, but of the entire Bill of Rights.

Agents should be instructed that their primary responsibility is to prevent crimes and violations of law, not solely to convict people. This conviction psychology is imbedded into the agent from his first association with an agency and ingrained while he remains there. All too often this conviction syndrome is generated by the publication of statistics aimed at proving the dedication and necessity of the agency. In short, compilation of self-serving statistics goads agents into all sorts of indiscretions. It makes a protector of society into a menace to liberty, a law enforcement officer into a potential violator of the law himself.

More civilized standards than the number of convictions should not be impalatable to Congress or to the people. Rather than branding law enforcement as lax when the conviction rate falls, we should study the overall reduced rate of crime. Putting people behind bars by illegal or questionable methods is no deterrent to crime; indeed, it acts only as a spur to competition in criminal acts.

The increasing difficulties of law enforcement, while partially due to lack of manpower, lukewarm citizen support, low salaries, etc., are attributable to a more deep-seated dilemma. Basically, law enforcement officers are confused as to what is or is not within the permissible scope of their duties. The IRS agents on the one hand were issued a directive by the Treasury Department, which was in existence since 1938, that completely banned wiretaps. On the other hand, the national office of IRS conducted a wiretap and snooping school, and furnished the equipment and experts to place the taps. Little wonder agents winked at the ban against wiretaps. Little wonder they had no fear of prosecution or other disciplinary action being taken against them. Setting forth specific guidelines in this code of conduct, plus education and the imposition of appropriate sanctions for its violation should alleviate the confusion of federal agents caused by such double standards.

Two major salutary effects could come from this legislation. One, the right of privacy will be given public recognition as the constitutional and basic human right that it is. Two, the professionalism, efficiency, effectiveness, and dignity of the Federal agent can be judged, assessed, and determined by his compliance or lack of compliance with the code.²⁷

²² *Rhodes v. Graham*, 238 Ky., 225, 37 S.W. 2d 46 (1931). Plaintiff was granted damages for invasions of privacy by means of a wiretap.

²³ 18 U.S.C., sec. 2236 (1958).

²⁴ A cleaning house for complaints against tactics of Federal agents could possibly be established. The recently created administrative conference may be of aid here. Its major advantage is that it would be independent of the agency it was investigating

These hearings have also pinpointed the need for further investigation into subjects tangentially related to invasions of privacy. The legal process of libel of information should be reviewed. This process exists as an anachronism in the law and permits the skirting of protections in certain cases afforded by a fourth amendment search warrant.

The summons powers and jeopardy assessment powers of the IRS should be reviewed with a view toward limiting their use and providing safeguards against abuse.

On an overall scale, Congress should be more wary of granting too much power to agencies. Indiscriminate grants have led to abuse and a lessening of congressional powers of control. It is hoped that from this point on, when Congress delegates its powers it will provide safeguards against abuse and retain some supervisory control over its delegates.

Congress should take more of an interest in how its laws are administered. No law is very effective or promotes social development unless it is properly administered. Laws today are being misconstrued, misread, or ignored by some of their administrators. It is Congress who represents the people; Congress must answer to the people. Delegating powers to bureaucrats who often answer to no one is not responsible representation of the people. If vigilance be the price of liberty, that price has to be paid by the Congress as well as by the people. Today we seem to be experiencing a vital lack of vigilance when law enforcement officials disobey the law and Congress allows liberty to be lessened by administrative fiat.

CONCLUSIONS

If the privacy so necessary to the development of a free and independent people is to be preserved, our national lethargy and lack of knowledge must be countered. These hearings and the legislation that can be created pursuant to them are steps in the right direction. But more is demanded; more is needed before we as a nation can reach a plateau of civilized existence above that on which we now abide. Citizen concern and assistance is vitally needed at this time to foster and nurture the neophyte strides made to protect our privacy and our heritage. Without them, this country is threatened with degradation into a comatose state of dependence and conformity. Encroachments on freedom begin on a small insidious scale. Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw this danger as exemplified by police excess in the name of law enforcement and his keen perception pinpointed the aspects of that danger: "[W]e are in danger of forgetting that the Bill of Rights reflects experience with police excesses. It is not only under Nazi rule that police excesses are inimical to freedom. It is easy to make light of insistence on scrupulous regard for the safeguards of civil liberties when invoked on behalf of the unworthy. It is too easy. History bears testimony that by such disregard are the rights of liberty extinguished, heedlessly at first, then stealthily, and brazenly in the end."²⁸

Would not all Americans feel more secure and justly proud of their democracy if the following were to become reality and no simple aphorism: "The poorest man may in his

and answerable to the President through its chairman. In 1952 the IRS set up its Inspection Division to check the integrity of its employees. The fact that no instances of wiretap were discovered or reported since its inspection is indicative of the ineffectiveness of a program to police police by police.

²⁸ *Davis v. United States*, 328 U.S. 582, 597 (1946) (dissenting opinion).

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

941

Yet there was no reason why the two Houses of Congress could not have taken a week for a serious discussion of the President's state of the Union message. It was at least a clear picture of a perplexed man. It defined the dilemmas if not their solutions.

In any other democratic country the parliament would have regarded such a message at such a time by the head of the government as an invitation to a debate. The leader of the opposition in both houses would have replied at length, defined the areas of agreement and disagreement. Experts on both sides of the aisle would have talked on the aspects of the message they know best. And at the end of the debate, the leaders of the majority party would have tried to answer the questions raised.

THE MYSTIFYING CLARIFICATIONS

Such a procedure not only clarifies the feeling of a democratic Congress, but is often useful to the Government executives who finally have to make the decisions. But no such orderly clarifying procedure has been followed here.

It may be objected that a public debate in the midst of the peace offensive would dramatize the divisions in the country on Vietnam—they are being dramatized anyway—but there is no reason why the Government, if it fears this result, cannot debate the issue in private. This was done during the last war, and while there were the inevitable leaks, these did little damage.

The present situation is remarkable in a number of other ways. President Woodrow Wilson died believing that the power of the Senate was so great in the field of foreign affairs that it could virtually paralyze the President, but today the President alone can decide whether to renew the bombing or extend the pause, to raise or lower the level of violence on the allied side, to bomb Hanoi and mine the harbor of Haiphong or leave them alone, to attack the Soviet ships carrying supplies to the North Vietnamese or ignore them, without even listening to the Senate.

THE CHINA QUESTION

There has been no real debate on the China question, which lies behind the whole war. It is not even clear whether the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have increased the number of attacks on our positions since the start of the peace offensive, for the Pentagon has testified that the attacks have increased and the President has said they have decreased.

If the purpose of all this is to confuse the enemy, it must be a success—for the so-called debate is certainly confusing everybody else. The American people are entitled at such a time to a candid and searching discussion of the issues in the Congress assembled, but this is precisely the one thing they have not had.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966.]

WASHINGTON: THE MIND OF ASIA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The mind of Asia, in all its different manifestations, is a constant puzzle to our policymakers in Washington.

The Vietcong are not intimidated by our superior firepower and airpower: They just keep on coming. The people in the South Vietnamese villages seem to resent the bombing of their dead more than the bombing of the living. The brutality of the Vietnamese to their fellow countrymen they capture is almost beyond our comprehension.

THE INDONESIAN MASSACRE

Seldom a week passes now without some startling illustration of the point. Not so long ago, the Communists in Indonesia were demonstrating against the United States, apparently with the approval of the Sukarno government and the Indonesian people.

Then came the brutal murder of five leading Indonesian generals and a vicious counter-attack against the Communists.

Since then, over 100,000, not 1 but 100,000 people, have been murdered in Indonesia, not in bombings but in savage manhunts. Even Sukarno concedes that 87,000 people have disappeared in this barbaric slaughter, and the intelligence services here put the total at nearer 130,000.

Understanding the European mind in the past 30 years has been hard enough for officials in Washington, but Asia is something quite different. The North Vietnamese do not react to our peace offensive as we thought they might. The South Vietnamese have been very quiet about it, not because they approved, but because, knowing their countrymen, they didn't think it would succeed.

Yet the same officials who have constantly been surprised by developments in Asia since the war, who were wrong in their calculations on the North Vietnamese bombing, wrong in their estimates of the effect of the American military buildup, wrong on a whole succession of Saigon Governments, and wrong on the effects of our successful monsoon campaign—these same officials are now being quite dogmatic again about China.

RUSK'S PARALLELS

Secretary of State Rusk is constantly drawing the parallel between the Nazi aggression in Europe and the Chinese aggression in Asia. His proposition is perfectly plain: China is the enemy. China must be stopped in this early phase of its aggressive expansion, just as the Nazis should have been stopped in the 1930's, and as the Soviets were stopped in Greece and Turkey, Persia and Berlin, after the last war.

He may be right, but then again he may not. The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, who is Burmese and presumably knows as much about Asia as Lyndon Johnson, sees China today not as a rogue elephant but as a nervous wreck. Prime Minister Sato of Japan thinks China is primarily concerned about her problems of production at home, and is using the war as a threat of foreign invasion to get more work out of the poor Chinese people.

DIFFERING VIEWS

When a country has been treated as an outcast, an outlaw, and a culprit, said the Secretary General, referring to China, "it is apt to act in a certain way * * *. In such a delicate stage, countries will sometimes show certain emotions, certain strong reactions, certain rigidities, and even a certain arrogance * * *."

These two views of China are not necessarily contradictory. If countries, like individuals, can have "nervous breakdowns," as U Thant suggests, they can also be dangerous, as Secretary Rusk assumes, but surely there is room here for more modest analysis of China, lest we commit more and more power to more and more false assumptions.

TIME TO THINK

The Communists may or may not need more time to think anew about the future course of the war and bring up supplies for the purpose, but the Johnson administration could certainly use more time. It is not agreed about how to proceed. It has not yet solved its supply problems in Vietnam, and it is not yet clear about the extent of the China menace or who is going to help contain China if it does go mad.

What, then, is the hurry? There is no danger that the American command can be overcome. We are constantly patrolling the enemy supply lines and will know in advance if any concentration of force is being gathered. And there's nothing in the situation other than past tradition that forces us to act before we take time to think.

MY SCOUTING PAST, YOUR SCOUTING FUTURE: BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, of all the many fine organizations in our country which help to build youngsters' lives, few are more important, more constructive or more inspiring than the Boy Scouts of America. America is truly indebted to over a million adult leaders who serve the Boy Scouts in individual troops, in headquarters and in other capacities.

Many of our outstanding leaders in public and private life have had the happy privilege of serving as scoutmasters. One of the finest descriptions of the joys and opportunities of scoutmaster has been given by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

In the January 1966 issue of the magazine, *Scouting*, he gives recollections of his days as a scoutmaster in South Dakota in the 1930's. And he summarizes the significance of today's and tomorrow's Scout work. "My Scouting Past, Your Scouting Future" is his theme.

I believe that his article will be of interest not only to all those who have worked with the Boy Scouts, but to many other thinking citizens as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MY SCOUTING PAST, YOUR SCOUTING FUTURE
(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Scouting is a joy—and a challenge. It is fun and fellowship, adventure and achievement, honor and patriotism.

That's how I felt when I was a Scout in Reverend Hart's troop 24 back in the little town of Doland, S. Dak., and that's how I remember my later years as a scoutmaster of troop 6 in Huron, S. Dak. And that's how I feel about scouting today.

My visit last spring to the national headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America brought back many fond memories. There was a large picture of Scoutmaster HUMPHREY and seven of his Scouts, and there were mementoes of all the early B.S.A. heroes—men like Beard, Seton, West, and Baden-Powell.

Then there were all those wonderful Norman Rockwell paintings that so accurately depict the adventure and the integrity of the scouting program. And there was a photograph of our first national jamboree that made me recall that in 1935 I was all set to attend that remarkable gathering of youth in Washington, D.C., when a national polio epidemic forced its postponement until 1937.

Appropriately enough, Mrs. Humphrey shared my visit to your national headquarters, just as she had shared so many of my days as scoutmaster. Mrs. Humphrey—Muriel—always enjoyed the outdoors and the company of Scouts. She called them young Indians.

An honor guard of uniformed Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers greeted us at national headquarters. How that colorful assortment of blue and gold, khaki, and green differed from my crop of boys in troop 6 back in Huron.

In those days our people were pretty down on their luck from dust storms and the depression. We had a rule that no one could have a new uniform, because we didn't want any boy to feel inadequate or inferior. So we passed around second-hand uniforms and

tried to outfit each boy from the hand-me-downs of older brothers. We made our camping equipment, too—at least some of it.

Old troop 6 was versatile when it came to meetings. We didn't even start out as a church basement operation—the church budget, like everything else, was the victim of the depression and, therefore, too skimpy to allow for heating the basement.

We were sponsored by the Good Fellowship Class of the Methodist Church and my first meeting was held in the church's vestibule during a dust storm. Later on we met outside the church, in the basement of Humphrey's Drugstore, in my living room, and, on occasion, even in Muriel's living room.

Those were difficult and trying days. Money was scarce and church funds were even less available. But we finally did get heat for that church basement, even though it took a small conspiracy and a well-kept secret.

We announced a big troop bean feed and promoted it all over town. A real crowd turned out and shivered through the meal. We had, on purpose, neglected to warn the folks that the basement wasn't heated. After that bean feed, the church officials managed to have it heated for us.

That was in 1933. I served as scoutmaster for about 3 years. During that eventful time we took into our troop a few boys who today might be labeled juvenile trouble-makers. In fact, some of them had been in a little trouble, but they were not bad boys. They simply needed guidance, activity, and work. And the Boy Scout troop offered these opportunities.

Working with the troop committee we found jobs for our boys. I hired two of them to work in the family drugstore and put them on their honor to do well and to keep out of trouble. Given a chance, they came through with flying colors.

Those were days when we took a firmer stand with our young people. I had an understanding with my Scouts that we weren't going to have any smoking. So, when I caught several of the boys red-handed, I told them, "You're through—beat it."

They were the most unhappy boys in the world and they started coming around my home every morning. Finally they got up enough courage to apologize and we took them all back into the troop—provided they abided by the rules.

Starting in 1935 I was a pretty busy person, what with my Scout meeting on Tuesday nights and courting Muriel on Thursday nights. Muriel was always a sort of assistant scoutmaster. Even in those early days before we were married she encouraged me to carry on my Scout work—apparently she was already learning to cooperate with the inevitable.

This was when Muriel earned the "fastest and best hamburger maker in South Dakota"—and those Scouts would eat them as fast as she could make them. They always preferred her cooking to mine, and no wonder.

Once on an overnight hike I decided to show the boys what a great cook I was. I prepared for them a simple desert—a sort of pudding of rice and raisins. I recall dropping a rather large portion of rice into a kettle of boiling water. The rice kept expanding. We wound up filling about every container in the camp with rice pudding. From that point on the Scouts of Troop 6 resolved to do their own cooking and leave their scoutmaster to other chores.

Sometimes I was worried about the quality of discipline in our troop. After all, eager, spirited young men are not easy to order about. But when the occasion required it, we would have good discipline. There was no need to be authoritarian or hard-fisted. Our discipline was based upon

fellowship, friendship, and a sense of pride in the achievements of troop 6.

When I wanted the boys to do something they did it because they knew I wanted it done. It reflected upon the record of our troop. I always was able to be "one of the gang" without losing their respect. We worked together, played together, and camped together.

I did my Scouting work right with the boys, starting as a Second Class Scout. I went on to Life Scout. Unfortunately, I didn't have the opportunity to finish my work as an Eagle Scout. But we had six Eagles in Troop 6 and that was good for those days.

Our town was Scout-minded; and with our little population, we had no less than six active troops. We had our own Scoutmaster's roundtable in Huron—all the Scoutmasters in town met once a week at noon. We developed great fellowship that way and great competition between troops.

By 1936 my future was taking a new turn. Muriel and I had decided to marry and to return to the University of Minnesota to complete my education which had been interrupted by the depression.

The move to Minnesota meant the end of my Scoutmaster days. On Scout Sunday during Boy Scout Week, I "preached" the sermon at the Methodist Church, then made my resignation official by presenting my khaki shirt to my good friend and fellow Scouter, the late Dewey Van Dyke.

As a Scoutmaster I was a novice and an apprentice. The success of Troop 6 was due in large measure to the man who served for some time as my assistant, Dewey Van Dyke, and to another outstanding church man and youth leader, Lynn LaCraft. It was Dewey and Lynn above all who gave stability, continuity, and leadership to Scouting in our community.

Dewey Van Dyke was full of stories of his youth and his experiences in World War I. He was a natural camper, loving the out of doors. He was the kind of man that boys respected. While short in stature, he was athletic, competitive, rugged, and a down-to-earth fellow. The boys loved him.

Dewey's only son, Bobby, was a member of Troop 6. He was an excellent Scout and he and his dad were inseparable companions. But early in Scouting, Bobby was to lose his life in a drowning accident. This was a tragic blow to Dewey and his wife, Hazel. Dewey's wife, like Muriel Humphrey, was a Scouter, too; her life was fully involved in the work of Troop 6.

The loss of Bobby Van Dyke was a blow to all of us. He was such a wonderful boy. But this sorrow and sadness that came to the Van Dykes served as an inspiration to Dewey. He redoubled his efforts in Scouting. He and Hazel literally adopted every boy in the troop. Instead of having one son, the Van Dykes now found themselves with anywhere from 25 to 35 boys—treating them all like their very own. Scouting to them was a labor of love.

My dear friend, Lynn LaCraft, a member of the troop committee, also lost his boy—a former troop member, Kendall—as a Navy pilot in World War II. They were also inseparable companions and dear friends to me.

Kendall was an outstanding Scout—an Eagle Scout. He was always the leader in the troop, a brilliant young man, athletic, an engaging personality, courageous, and cooperative.

Lynn LaCraft went on as did my friend, Dewey Van Dyke, to become a Scout leader, giving unselfishly of his life to other young men.

Tragedy befell two families—the Van Dykes and the LaCrafts—but they eased their sorrow and pain by giving of themselves to others. This is what it takes to make a great Scout leader—giving, sharing, caring for

others. What wonderful memories these names bring back, memories of friendship and devotion to the highest values.

We who have served as volunteers receive far more from the Scouting program than we can possibly give it. Whatever I gave to Scouting was richly rewarded by the joys, satisfaction, and opportunities of working with my boys of Troop 6.

Few experiences can compare with the rich pleasure of seeing boys with whom you have worked grow to sturdy manhood and positions of respect in community life.

An investment in time and energy with youngsters reaps the greatest "dividends"—personally, for the boys, the sponsoring institution, for town and Nation. No wonder Scouting has grown and will continue to grow.

Best of all, it is voluntary. This voluntarism is a unique characteristic of American life—the willingness of people to give of themselves to help others, the sharing and the building together out of conviction rather than ordered direction. Scouting is one of the finest examples of America's genius to get things done through the citizen's own initiative and responsibility. And it offers continuing challenge to so many adults who feel a deep desire to keep America free and to preserve the spirit of personal initiative and self-discipline.

Scouting is more needed today than ever before. Life in America has changed greatly in the last quarter of a century. Family unity is tested more than ever. People are constantly on the move and often our roots are not as deep as they used to be. Scouting unites neighbors and former strangers, welds communities, builds tremendous good will and understanding internationally.

As a former mayor, as a U.S. Senator, and now, as Vice President, I have seen Scouting's good works in so many ways and places. Today in America's war against poverty, Scouting is helping to bring many disadvantaged youngsters into a new, better life.

Sometimes this expansion of scouting may not be easy, but it is in the finest Scout tradition. You're interested in the boy—not his race, color, or religion. The boy's own growth, his work, his skill—these are the things that count. You want to see that every boy is taught respect for law and order and the great institutions of our country—the family, home, church, government, industry.

Quite appropriately this "missionary" challenge is part of your current breakthrough for youth program, a national effort to make scouting even more effective and meaningful as it is brought within the reach of more and more boys. You are absolutely right to be doing this, because the program is too good to keep to ourselves.

Also on the scouting horizon is a significant event for all Americans—next year's 12th World Jamboree in Idaho. This will be the first time our country has been privileged to be host for this international show of scouting brotherhood. God willing, I hope to be there.

What a joy it will be to have boys from all over the world in our country.

What an opportunity it will be for them to see this land of ours, and how fortunate we will be to know the future leaders of other nations. They will come here as youngsters, but in a few years they will be guiding universities, managing businesses, leading trade unions, or serving in positions in government. They will be helping to build a finer, more peaceful world.

In our own land, Boy Scouts and their leaders will play an ever-more important role in helping America realize its highest ideals. For scouting is a vital activity in a truly great society. In his inaugural address, President Lyndon B. Johnson so well described " * * * the excitement of becoming—always becoming, trying, probing, falling,

either by undue responsibility or the restraints of size" (p. 117). The statement smacks more of a somnolent old mens club rather than the U.S. Senate which has a large number of relatively young men and bustles with activity and overwork—even with the 6-year term.

I found the chapters by Richard P. Fenno, Jr. ("The Internal Distribution of Influence: The House"), Harvey C. Mansfield ("The Congress and Economic Policy") and Holbert N. Carroll ("The Congress and National Security Policy") worthwhile and provocative. I do question Professor Carroll's statement concerning foreign aid authorization and appropriations legislation as far as the U.S. Senate is concerned. He notes that while substantial bipartisan majorities have supported these programs "since the mid-1950's, however, more than half of the Democrats from the South and, since the late 1940's, some two-thirds of the Republicans from the Middle West have voted 'No'" (p. 166). The fact is that during the 8 Eisenhower years of the 12 rollcall votes on final passage of either the mutual security authorization or appropriations bills, a majority of midwestern Republican Senators supported foreign aid in each of the 8 years except 1956. They did so often by 2 to 1 and 3 to 2 margins. Under a Democratic administration the record has been no different. In the final vote on June 14, 1965, on the Foreign Aid Authorizations for fiscal year 1966, six midwestern Republican Senators voted for the bill, only three were opposed. This has included the consistent support of Senators DIRKSEN, HICKENLOOPER, and MUNDT, among others.

Dean Truman concludes in "The Prospects for Change" that "One thread that runs through all of these essays is the dispersion of power, in the past half century apparently an increasing dispersion, within and between the Houses of Congress" (p. 178). He believes that many reforms such as separate days for committee and floor work, additional personal staff, home rule for the District of Columbia, a requirement of joint hearings by House and Senate committees, and even disclosure of assets and income by Members would be insubstantial in actual effect on Congress. Reforms which would further dispersion, in his judgment would include some of the "democratizing ones such as requiring fewer signatures on" a discharge petition. Truman is equally unenthusiastic regarding the introduction of electronic voting equipment and other time-savers. He believes this "would strengthen minority control by facilitating snap votes" (p. 180).

Truman views as most promising those measures which would increase leadership control not only over the floor, but also over the committee timetable. He agrees with Huntington as to the need for the Speaker or the Senate majority leader to select committee chairmen or at least to have the majority caucus choose a chairman from among the top three on each committee provided the leadership "were able and willing to make their preferences prevail" (p. 181). Otherwise the result, Truman thinks, would be a further dispersion of power.

Truman notes the various outside developments which have contributed to congressional cohesion (an executive budget and legislative program, White House legislative liaison, and regular Presidential consultation with his own congressional leaders). But he longs for the suggestion made by Huntington and others that there be a congressional commitment to bring to a vote top priority legislation from the administration. One recalls Senator Taft, and the attempt to draft striking railroad workers under another Truman—President Harry S. Truman—and is perhaps as glad that we lack such an urgency procedure.

I do think Dean Truman is profoundly correct in concluding that "The Congress and its power structure cannot profitably be viewed as something separate and isolable from the remainder of the Government and society. They affect and are affected by needs and changes in the society and in the Government as a whole. They must, therefore, be looked at within this context" (p. 183).

That is why I am optimistic regarding reform. Reform has come in Congress and between Congress and the Executive over the years. Reform will continue to come. Perhaps it will not come as rapidly as some of us would like. Perhaps it will come more rapidly than some of our colleagues prefer. But it is coming and will come, and in the process it has been aided by the thoughtful presentations such as "The Congress and America's Future," which have stimulated thought not only in various regional meetings of the American assembly throughout America but also in Congress and among the interested public generally.

UNAUTHORIZED VISIT TO NORTH VIETNAM BY THREE AMERICANS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, according to an article carried in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 20, 1966, the President of Yale University, Kingman Brewster, Jr., made a statement pertaining to the visit of Prof. Staughton Lynd to Hanoi.

Prof. Staughton Lynd, together with Communist Historian Herbert Aptheker, and Thomas Hayden, founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, several weeks ago obtained permission to visit Brussels, Belgium. When they got to Brussels they took a Communist plane provided by the Communists that carried them to Prague, Moscow, Peiping, and finally to Hanoi.

In Hanoi they met with the Communist leader. Out of Hanoi Professor Lynd, of Yale University, sent a telegram to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations asking for the right to appear before that committee and give testimony.

I am quite certain that the Committee on Foreign Relations will not honor Aptheker, the practical leader of the Communists in the United States, nor Professor Lynd, nor Hayden, by allowing them to appear before that committee.

However, it is rather refreshing to note that President Kingman Brewster, Jr., of Yale University, had the courage and the recognition of civil responsibility to speak up in regard to Professor Lynd.

Professor Lynd teaches at Yale. I now wish to quote from an Associated Press dispatch from New Haven, Conn.:

Yale University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., said yesterday that Staughton Lynd was "naive and misguided" in making an unauthorized trip to North Vietnam.

He had stronger words about the assistant history professor's speech in Hanoi, saying that it was "a disservice to the causes of freedom of dissent, freedom of travel, and conscientious pacifism."

In addition, President Brewster said he felt that Lynd's "disparagement of his country's leadership and policies, while in Hanoi, damaged the causes he purports to serve."

President Brewster then went on to

refer to the statements ascribed to Lynd, which Lynd reportedly affirmed, to the effect that "while in Hanoi" Professor Lynd "publicly asserted that the Johnson administration lies to the American people and that the U.S. policy is immoral, illegal and antidemocratic."

Madam President, those statements are a disservice to our country. We can tolerate dissent about judgments, but we cannot tolerate persons going around the world unlawfully and depreciating the cause of their country, not by speaking the truth to their own people, but by trying to help Communists.

I repeat what I said last week: The Attorney General should investigate this visit to Hanoi, and if he finds there has been a violation of law, he should institute the necessary proceedings to see to it that justice is done.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Jan. 20, 1966]

SAYS PROFESSOR IS NAIVE: YALE PREXY ATTACKS LYND FOR HANOI TALK

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—Yale University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., said yesterday that Staughton Lynd was "naive and misguided" in making an unauthorized trip to North Vietnam.

He had stronger words about the assistant history professor's speech in Hanoi, saying that it was "a disservice to the causes of freedom of dissent, freedom of travel, and conscientious pacifism."

In his first direct comment on Lynd's activities, Brewster said he felt that Lynd's "disparagement of his country's leadership and policies, while in Hanoi, damaged the causes he purports to serve."

Lynd and two other Americans, Thomas Hayden, a founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, and Herbert Aptheker, a Communist Party theoretician, spent 10 days in North Vietnam, defying a State Department ban on travel there.

Brewster cited Hanoi radio reports, which he said Lynd reportedly confirmed, "that while in Hanoi he publicly asserted that the Johnson administration lies to the American people and that the U.S. policy is immoral, illegal and antidemocratic."

Brewster said that Lynd is entitled to his opinions, "but the use of his presence in Hanoi to give this aid and comfort to a government engaged in hostilities with American forces seems to me inconsistent with the purposes of factfinding in the name of peace."

Last week, when Lynd was asked about the radio Hanoi broadcast, he denied that he said the administration "lied" to the American people. He said he delivered the same speech last year at a rally in Washington, D.C.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Jan. 20, 1966]

OPPOSES SENATE UNIT HEARING: IGNORE LYND, LAUSCHE URGES

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, said yesterday he would vigorously oppose allowing three Americans who went to Hanoi to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

LAUSCHE, a committee member, was referring to Asst. Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale University; Thomas Hayden, founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, and

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

917

come to play a more and more significant role as spokesman for the interests of unorganized individuals" (p. 25). Much of this is all too true but it overlooks the fact that if a Senator want to be a legislator, he can be. Many of our finest legislators come from the smaller States where constituent pressures are not so great in sheer volume. On the other hand, the legislator from the large State who desires to perform a legislative rather than errand boy function has a unique opportunity to do so since the great size of his State can enable him to be relatively freer of particular interest group pressures. While Senators and Representatives do strive to serve as a court of last resort with the administration for the unorganized individual, I do think Members of Congress in both parties are well aware of "the principal organized social forces of society" and definitely so if they operate in one's own State.

Huntington disagrees, correctly I think, with the so-called democratizers who "attack the power of the Senate Establishment or inner club and urge an equalizing of power among Congressmen so that a majority of each House can work its will," (p. 27). This dispersion of power would only lead to further oligarchy and he believes "the only effective alternative to oligarchy is centralized authority." Thus Huntington argues that the Speaker in the House and the majority leader in the Senate should select committee chairman and thus "restore to Congress a more positive role in the legislative process and strengthen it vis-a-vis the executive branch" (p. 28). Such a suggestion would be more likely to intensify the "rubber stamp" aspects of a particular transitory majority, but I doubt if it would further the accommodation intrinsic and necessary, to the legislative process. Nor would it promote the interpersonal relations required to accomplish business in a chamber such as the Senate where much is accomplished by unanimous consent. The fact is that some committee chairmen in both Houses remain where they are because a majority likes it that way since these chairmen can withstand the heat. Other chairmen who block a majority are circumvented in various informal ways when the majority desires.

Huntington feels that "recruitment of Senators from the national scene rather than from local politics would significantly narrow the gap between Congress and the other elements of national leadership. The 'local politics' ladder to the Senate would be replaced or supplemented by a 'national politics' line in which mobile individuals might move from the establishment to the administration to the Senate" (p. 29). It is an interesting suggestion and probably there will be a few unique examples where this happens, but if it had been the prevailing practice in the last two decades, two Presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson and two Vice Presidents Richard M. Nixon and Hubert H. Humphrey, would not have risen to national power. They were strictly products of the "local politics" ladder each of them beginning as either Congressman or mayor.

Huntington offers another possibility of a role for Congress and that is as a vehicle for approving or disapproving Presidential requests within a given time period of 3 or 6 months. He notes: "If thus compelled to choose openly, Congress, it may be supposed, would almost invariably approve Presidential requests. Its veto power would become a reserve power like that of the Supreme Court if not like that of the British Crown. On these urgent measures it would perform a legitimizing function rather than a legislative function" (p. 30).

He assumes that such a procedure would induce the executive leaders to consult with congressional leaders prior to the submis-

sion of such legislation and that Congress would continue to amend and vote freely on nonurgent executive requests. I completely disagree. Certainly the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were two acts which might well be put in the urgent category, yet to have Congress simply vote them up or down without the right to change them would have been wrong from the standpoint of eventual implementation of these measures, as well as from the acceptance of the country for them. The fact is that Members of Congress urged these measures—and more comprehensive ones—before the Chief Executive submitted any at all. The fact is that in the case of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 it was largely written in the Senate Republican leader's office where by letting diverse viewpoints be aired, a version was agreed upon which was assured of passage. But even then further substantial—and worthwhile, e.g. the poll tax ban—amendments occurred in committee and on the floor of both Chambers.

With then Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, I was one of the Senate floor leaders in enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As leaders of a bipartisan coalition, we also attempted, over the years, at the beginning of three Congresses to change rule XXII which permits the filibuster. In order to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 we were required to shut off a filibuster by securing approval from two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, which in practical terms meant two-thirds of the whole Senate. We did that. I think many of us who believe in majority cloture whereby 51 of 100 Senators could invoke cloture, after a stipulated period of time, say a month, or so, realize that despite the time it took us and the obstacles we had to overcome, when we got there, we had a consensus in this land which no narrow sectionalism could afford to overlook.

H. Douglas Price has written a brilliant and perceptive chapter entitled "The Electoral Arena" showing the effect of one's electoral district, party organization, and the cost of campaigning on the type of person, "local" or "cosmopolitan," elected. He notes, correctly and, I think, regrettably that the "blur of activity" one often witnesses in the House or Senate Office Buildings "has little or nothing to do with pending legislation or public policy, but a great deal to do with the reelection possibilities of the Members of the House and Senate," (p. 48). Not all Senators or Representatives are errand boys but there is no question that before one can be a statesman one must get elected. And who, in a free society, would have it another way?

Ralph K. Huitt, in a well-written essay, has analyzed the Senate with care and sentiment ("The Internal Distribution of Influence: The Senate"). As a staff man (for Lyndon Johnson and WILLIAM PROXMIER), he had a unique opportunity to view the Senate from different perspectives. His comments on the role of individual and committee staffs and why these professionals serve is particularly noteworthy (pp. 97-98). In his first category of reforms which would strengthen the hands of the elected leaders, he retains the political scientist's nerve to change the seniority system, although his views are more tempered than most since he notes that "if it cannot be destroyed, at least chairmen might be required to relinquish their authority at a certain age or the committee majority might be given some choice among the ranking members" (p. 98).

Professor Huitt advocates a second category of reforms which would bring some coordination to the spending and taxing programs of Congress. I completely agree with him. In testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I stated that I was disturbed that the appropriations process in Congress bears little relationship to the economic, tax, monetary,

and fiscal policies with which it should be intimately involved. I recommended that the Joint Economic Committee be reconstituted to include the chairman, the ranking minority member, and a majority member from the following committees: The Appropriations and Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance. Because of the tremendous economic impact which the decisions of the Armed Services and Public Works Committees of both Houses also have on Government spending and our economy perhaps they, too, should be represented. In addition, there should be greater coordination between the subcommittees which are practically autonomous and the full Committee on Appropriations in both Houses. The President's economic report should also be submitted more frequently and at a time when it can be utilized by the individual Members of Congress.

Huitt notes that a third category of reforms relates to the effectiveness of individual members and that "allowances for office help and materials are wholly inadequate for Senators from populous States. These are nagging nuisances which reduce a Senator's efficiency" (p. 99). Again, he is completely correct. While he does not outline specific reforms, I would like to note a few which I also mentioned to the Joint Committee: authorizing each Member to have an additional legislative assistant for each of his standing committee assignments, provision for more adequate space, professional staff (especially for the minority), travel, telephone, and mail allowances, especially for Members from larger States, securing management consultants to scrutinize senatorial offices and develop up-to-date procedures, precommittee staff hearings, elimination of senatorial consideration of postmaster appointments, permission for the military academies to select students via nationwide competitive examinations on a geographical basis, and establishment of a separate board of former Senators and Congressmen to consider private immigration bills and small claims.

Professor Huitt's fourth category of reforms "is aimed at the conduct of individual Members which brings discredit on the whole body" (p. 99). He is not talking so much about unlawful conduct as that "behavior which falls in a kind of twilight zone where the ethics of the individual must be the regulator" (p. 99). I agree, only I would be more specific, as I attempted to be before the Joint Committee, when I urged that standards be applied not only to the Members of Congress but also to the professional staffs and other Senate officials as well as to all candidates for congressional office in a primary, special, or general election. Such standards should also be applied to the senior career and policymaking Members of the executive and judicial branches.

Richard E. Neustadt in "Politicians and Bureaucrats" has written with skill of the relationships between the executive and legislative branches and within the executive establishment. He notes correctly that "presidential appointees are men-in-the-middle, owing loyalty at once to the man who put them there, to the laws they administer, and to the body of careerists, backed by clientele, whose purposes they both direct and serve" (p. 109). Professor Neustadt's administrative experience is perhaps greater than his experience on Capitol Hill, since I am not inclined to agree with his soothing statement that "for most of its inhabitants the Senate is a pleasant place, possessed of quite enough prestige and power (or its semblance), and amenities of staff and space, and time to enjoy them (6 years at a crack), so that it alone remains what much of Government once was, a refuge for the spirit of political free enterprise, unfettered

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

919

Herbert Aptheker, U.S. Communist Party historian.

Charging that the three men violated the laws of the United States in their unauthorized travel to Communist Vietnam and ought to be prosecuted, LAUSCHE said in a Senate speech:

"I can suffer disagreements with the views of the President and other distinguished leaders about the course that we should follow in South Vietnam.

"However, neither I nor the general citizenry and, of course, not the Members of the U.S. Senate, should give tolerance or sufferance to persons who make statements hoping that the Communists of North Vietnam would be victorious.

"These individuals are not promoting the cause of the United States. They should not be listened to; they should be recognized not in their false but their true colors which cause them to have greater sympathy for the cause of the Communists than for the cause of our own citizenry and Nation."

COMMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH ON THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I have had access to the information contained in the President's budget message. I wish to make certain comments at this time and, if necessary, be permitted to have 1 additional minute beyond the 3 minutes allocated in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, the President's 1967 budget program demonstrates responsible fiscal and economic policy appropriate to the times.

With this program we can move closer toward the goals of what is characterized as the Great Society at home while strengthening our resistance to aggression abroad.

With this program we can look forward to a continuation of the unprecedented and uninterrupted economic growth of the past 5 years.

With this program, we can meet our domestic needs without either recession or inflation.

Since early 1961, the total national output has risen by nearly \$200 billion, employment has increased by more than 6½ million workers, and the unemployment rate has dropped from 7 percent to close to 4 percent, a decrease which is highly encouraging.

In the year ahead, even higher levels of output, income, and employment can be expected. To sustain a sound and prosperous economy, the President is calling for a modest measure of fiscal restraint. He has proposed a set of tax measures which economic experts say will soak up a small proportion of the rising demand in the economy and enable the Government to achieve a small surplus in its cash transactions with the public. I have no reason to doubt the validity of the appraisal by the experts.

In sum, the President's 1967 budget provides adequately for furthering our domestic and international objectives without imposing undue strain on our economic potential or productive capabilities. His budget proposals, I believe, by and large, are both prudent and re-

strained. Together with responsible efforts by business and labor, our national and international objectives can be advanced—and advanced in an environment of steady yet noninflationary economic growth.

WHOM DO WE KILL IN VIETNAM?

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, in a two-page advertisement in the New York Times yesterday, January 23, 1966, the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam answered the question uppermost in the minds of all of us: "Whom Do We Kill in Vietnam?"

The committee's membership is impressive. I ask unanimous consent that their names and addresses be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the names and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE ON VIETNAM (AFFILIATED WITH THE CLERGYMEN'S EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR VIETNAM OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION)

Howard B. Radest, executive director, American Ethical Union, New York.

Msgr. Thomas J. Reese, director, Catholic social services, Wilmington, Del.

Esko Rintala, general secretary, Finnish Bible Society, Turku, Finland.

Rt. Rev. T. D. Roberts, archbishop (retired) of Bombay, London.

Rev. W. Harold Row, executive secretary, general brotherhood board, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

Rt. Rev. John W. Sadiq, bishop of Nagpur, India.

Dr. Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary.

Prof. Hiroshi Shinmi, associate secretary, World Council of Churches, Tokyo.

Dr. Pavel Simek, curator of the Synod, Czech Brethren, Prague.

Rev. Gerard S. Sloyan, head, religious education department, Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Francois Smyth-Florentin, general secretary, Bible study service, Protestant Federation of France.

Rev. Lord Donald Soper, former president, Methodist Church, Great Britain.

Vaclav Tomes, president, Baptist Union of Czechoslovakia.

Prof. Dr. Hans Urner, Halle/Saale, GDR (East Germany).

Rev. Valdo Vinay, professor, Waldenian Theology, Rome.

Prof. Wilhelm Vischer, Reformed Church of France.

Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, president, Central Conference American Rabbis, Chicago.

Dr. Charles C. West, professor, Christian ethics, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.

Jan-Eric Wikstrom, president, Svenska Missionsforbundet, Stockholm.

Very Rev. Colin Winter, dean, St. George's Cathedral, Windhoek, southwest Africa.

Bishop Friedrich Wunderlich, Methodist Church, GFR (West Germany).

Rev. Ake Zeterberg, dean, Stockholm Cathedral, and member of Parliament, Stockholm.

A Vietnam Buddhist, a leading monk in South Vietnam, whose name is withheld for reasons of prudence.

Dr. Helmut Bandt (professor systematic theology), University of Greifswald, GDR (East Germany).

Rev. Dr. William Barclay (professor of theology), Glasgow University, Scotland.

Prof. Dr. Karl Barth, University of Basel, Switzerland.

Colin W. Bell, executive secretary, Ameri-

can Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Daniel Berrigan, S.I., associate editor, Jesuit Missions, New York.

La Campagne des Pasteurs (120 Reformed Church pastors), Geneva, Switzerland.

Archbishop Canon S. H. Best, West Australia.

Dr. Harold A. Bosley, minister, Christ Church (Methodist), New York.

Rev. Girardo A. Bote, district superintendent, Methodist Church, Philippines.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, Garrett Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.

Prof. Aldo Capitini, director, Center of Religious Orientation, Perugia, Italy.

Canon L. John Collins, St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

Bishop Geoffrey F. Cramswick, Tasmania.

Rev. Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president, National Council of Churches, Chester, Pa.

Danilo Dolci, Sicily.

Dr. Ansgar Eeg-Olofsson, president, mission board, Evenska Missionsforbundet, Sweden.

Dr. Ragnar Forbeck, former dean, Oslo Cathedral, Norway.

Msgr. Paul Hanly Furfey, professor of sociology, Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, Temple Israel, Boston.

Dr. Helmut Gollwitzer, professor of systematic theology, University of Bonn, GFR (West Germany).

Prof. Mario Gozzini, Florence, Italy.

Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Methodist Church, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, the Unitarian-Universalist Association of United States, Boston.

Rolf-Dieter Gunther, national director of youth work, Evangelical Church, Brandenburg, GDR (East Germany).

Bishop Odd Hagen, Methodist bishop for northern Europe, Stockholm.

Bishop M. Hald, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Dr. Georgia Harkness, professor of theology, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.

Alfred Hassler, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, N.Y.

Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Dr. Ralph M. Holdeman, associate director, evangelism, National Council of Churches, New York.

Vaclav Hunaty, general superintendent, Methodist Church, Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Dean Alfred Jowett, Manchester Cathedral, England.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Oberkirchenrat Heinz Kloppenburg, Dortmund, GFR (West Germany).

Prof. H. Kohlbrugge, Utrecht University, Netherlands.

Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, bishop (retired), western Mass.

Rev. Dr. Lindhardt, director, department of theology, University of Copenhagen.

Rt. Rev. Glyn Llandaff, lord bishop of Llandaff, Wales.

Rt. Rev. Sir George MacLeod, former moderator, Church of Scotland, Glasgow.

Dr. Kenneth MacMillan, general secretary, Canadian Bible Society.

Rev. Domenico Maselli, president, Italian Evangelistic Mission, Assembly, Naples.

Rt. Rev. Robert H. Mize, bishop of Damaraland, southwest Africa.

Dr. Juan Nabong, president Philippines Christian College, Manila.

Dr. John Oliver Nelson, former professor, Yale Divinity School, Bangor, Pa.

Bishop Tiran Nersoyan, Armenian Orthodox Church, Evanston, Ill.

Kirchepräsident Martin Niemöller, co-president, World Council of Churches, Wiesbaden, GFR (West Germany).

Rev. Amor V. Oribello, moderator, Central Luzon Conference, United Church of Christ, Philippines.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the advertisement gave only a partial list of those endorsing the statement and I ask unanimous consent that the statement, the partial list of names and addresses of ministers, rabbis, and priests endorsing the statement, as well as the statement itself and reasons for the statement given by the Fellowship of Reconciliation be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement, names, and addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the statement signed by all these eminent men is impressive because it separately addresses itself to the United States, to the people and Government of North Vietnam, to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and to the people and Government of the People's Republic of China. It is my earnest hope that the pleas for peace contained in this statement will be heeded by all those so vitally concerned.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966]
International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam (affiliated with the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation).

STATEMENT BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE IN VIETNAM—THEY ARE OUR BROTHERS WHOM WE KILL

No generation has had shown to it more clearly than ours the interdependence of all men. No matter what the reasons we advance for the killing we do—in Vietnam or elsewhere—they are our brothers whom we kill. More indeed than our brothers—they are ourselves and our children, for as surely as we do not find other ways than war for solving our human problems, we destroy the future for ourselves and for them.

We who sign this statement are impelled to speak by the tragedy of Vietnam, and by the failure of governments to end that terrible conflict. Yet we think not only of Vietnam, but of all our apprehensive world, torn by contending ideologies and ambitions, of which Vietnam is the present symbol. We, who in various ways have assumed the terrible responsibility of articulating the human conscience, must speak or, literally, we should expect the very stones to cry out.

We know the claims of both sides in the Vietnamese conflict. Each professes its own moral rectitude. The United States and its allies assert their determination to stop what they describe as "ruthless Communist aggression" in order to defend freedom, both for Vietnam and for the world. North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and the People's Republic of China vigorously proclaim their intention to throw back the "ruthlessly aggressive American imperialists" in defense of the right of the Vietnamese to govern themselves, and on behalf of all those nations that are seeking "national liberation." Each side rejects with scorn the claims of the other, and ridicules the possibility that its antagonist may be sincere.

We do not question the sincerity of either side. On the contrary, the passionate conviction that each has of its own absolute rightness profoundly alarms us. Their determination seems to have no terminal point; to prove its case, each seems willing to risk

the ultimate nuclear conflict and jeopardize the future of the human race.

Helpless villagers in Vietnam, unable either to escape or defend themselves, recoil from the bombing of one side and from the terror of the other. War has become a way of life for them, dominating their rice paddies and marketplaces, conscripting their young men, making widows of their women and orphans of their children, holding a whole population hostage to horror. In such circumstances, the claims of both sides become a mockery of the noble words they use. Freedom and justice are for men; they are not achieved by the tormenting of men.

We address ourselves to the rulers of nations, and to those associated with them: Lyndon B. Johnson, Nguyen Cao Ky, Ho Chi Minh, and Mao Tse-tung.

Continuation of the war will not prove which side is right and which wrong. It will only increasingly force both sides to commit such atrocities as will mock all their claims. It will draw both sides farther and farther into a maelstrom of destruction in which mankind as a whole may finally be engulfed.

You, each of you, has the opportunity at least to try to reverse this dreadful course, and each of you has the responsibility. We plead with you to accept it, now, today, in the interest of all humanity.

We address ourselves to our fellow human beings everywhere.

Each of our nations has its hopes and aspirations, its own history and grievances and resentments. We live in widely differing social systems and ideologies, which seem to have in common only one thing: a willingness to resort to war in their own interests.

But war cannot serve the interests of men any longer, if it ever could. In this age, no matter for what ends war is fought, it can only destroy all our hopes and all our accomplishments. We must find new, nonmilitary ways of dealing with the conflicts and misunderstandings that inevitably arise among us, and to secure justice for all men.

We recognize and respect the necessary functions of government. We are not disloyal; we honor the accomplishments and particular values of our respective societies. But governments have as their proper responsibility the safety and well-being of their citizens, and in our world that well-being cannot be achieved through the military confrontation of competing states.

It is your responsibility and ours to make this known, unmistakably and in every way open to us. To this end, we who sign this statement have committed ourselves as a beginning. We represent many religious faiths in many countries, but we are of a common mind in our plea to all the contending parties.

To the people and Government of the United States of America:

The horrors that your planes and massive firepower are inflicting on the people of Vietnam are beyond any moral or political justification. The destruction of whole villages and the murder of masses of non-combatants which are the consequences of your policies cannot be excused on any grounds whatever. We believe that there is wrong on both sides, but that, as the only one of the world's major powers directly involved, you bear the heaviest responsibility for the initiation of peace moves. We call on you:

To stop the air attacks in both North and South Vietnam, at once, unilaterally, not simply as a political move in the direction of negotiations, but because those attacks are an affront to human decency and unworthy of a great people;

To express a clear intention to withdraw all U.S. military forces from Vietnam, consistent with the 1954 Geneva Agreements, to take effect immediately on conclusion of satisfactory arrangements to assure the Vietnamese people a free choice of government;

To state unequivocally your readiness to negotiate an end of the war on the basis of the 1954 agreements, with the National Liberation Front as one of the principals in the negotiations.

To the people and Government of North Vietnam, and to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam:

The opposition to your cause is not motivated solely by what you call the "aggressive imperialism" of the United States. Honest, brave Vietnamese patriots who fought beside you in the Viet Minh against the French are among those who fight against you now. They distrust your intentions; they cherish certain rights and freedoms which they suspect you of wanting to destroy; they are shocked and repelled by some of the methods you use. We believe that a heavy responsibility for ending the war honorably rests with the United States, but that there is also a very heavy responsibility on you to create the conditions of peace. We call on you:

To abandon the methods of torture, assassination, the indiscriminate bombing of civilians and other forms of terror. They are an affront to the whole concept of human decency, and hopelessly degrade your cause. No consideration whatever of either justice or vengeance can excuse such tactics;

To issue a clear statement that any Vietnamese Government in which you may have a part will honor the right of its citizens to practice their religions in absolute freedom, and that there will be no reprisals against those who have fought against you;

To express your unqualified willingness to meet with representatives of the United States and the present South Vietnamese Government to negotiate peace and the future of your country, based on the 1954 agreements.

To the people and government of the People's Republic of China:

Your influence in southeast Asia is enormous, your words and actions are weighed throughout the world as portents of the future. We call on you:

To refrain from statements and actions that harden already bitter attitudes on both sides, and so perpetuate the war;

To make clear your willingness to see the countries of southeast Asia develop their institutions of government and society free from outside intervention by force, and free from the military presence of any foreign powers.

It is hard to imagine a world so torn by suspicion and hatred as is ours turning away from war and toward the resolution of conflict and the building of justice by non-violent means, yet we humans have no other choice, and in our great religious heritage we have the guidelines we need to make this difficult decision. We call on all those, of whatever faith and nationality, who share our concern, to join us in our efforts to build a truly human society on earth.

U.S. MINISTERS, RABBIS AND PRIESTS (PARTIAL LIST)

William Abbot, Los Angeles, Calif.
Herman C. Absher, Salisbury, N.C.
Melvin Abson, Geneva, N.Y.
Lyman Achenbach, Columbus, Ohio.
Merlin J. Ackerson, Rowan, Iowa.
Eugene H. Adams, Holden, Mass.
Oscar M. Adam, Seal Beach, Calif.
Thomas F. Adams, Versailles, Ohio.
Roy Charles Agle, Brockport, N.Y.
Alvin A. Ahern, Churchville, N.Y.
Paul H. Alexander, Parker, Ariz.
Charles T. Allen, Chelsea, Mass.
Wesley H. Allen, Yonkers, N.Y.
Carl Allinger, Evansville, Ind.
Albert Allinger, Somerville, N.J.
Lawrence F. Almond, Boston, Mass.
Ezekiel T. Alvarado, Mountain View, Calif.
Bruce F. Anderson, Collinsville, Conn.
Elmer S. Andersen, San Mateo, Calif.

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

921

Jay W. Anderson, Wichita, Kans.
 John C. Anderson, Warwick, N.Y.
 Wm. C. Anderson, Marion, Tex.
 Leslie E. Andrews, Wakeeney, Kans.
 Lloyd R. Applegate, Collingswood, N.J.
 Lewis F. Archer, Madison, N.J.
 Merle S. Arnold, Williamsport, Pa.
 John K. Arnot, La Grange Park, Ill.
 David W. Ash, Ottumwa, Iowa.
 Richard H. Athey, Prairie Village, Kans.
 Lester W. Auman, Spirit Lake, Iowa.
 James L. Austin, Rockville, Conn.
 Clarence F. Avey, Oxford, Mass.
 Leif H. Awes, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Joseph B. Axenroth, Durham, N.H.
 Thomas E. Alston, Valparaiso, Ind.
 Frederick H. Allen, Findlay, Ohio.
 William H. Allison, Cashmere, Wash.
 Rabbi M. M. Abramowitz, Springfield, Ill.
 Layen R. Adelmann, Odessa, Minn.
 Ole Arnold, Burlington, Colo.
 James L. Airey, Portland, Oreg.
 J. E. Arthur, Saginaw, Mich.
 M. P. Andrews, Jr., Alderw'd Manor, Wash.
 K. Brooke Anderson, Cambridge, Mass.
 K. Roy Bailey, Omaha, Nebr.
 Ralph C. Bailey, Danbury, Conn.
 Robert B. Bailey, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Glen M. Baird, Ellicott City, Md.
 John D. Baker, Washington, Kans.
 George H. Baldrige, Atwood, Ill.
 Lee M. Baldwin, Owaneoc, Ill.
 Frederic E. Balt, Chicago, Ill.
 Lee H. Ball, Arlsley, N.Y.
 Rabbi Henry Bamberger, Sharon, Mass.
 Russell B. Barbour, Perkiomenville, Pa.
 C. Eugene Barnard, Roseville, Calif.
 Jack L. Barnes, Macon, Mo.
 Glenn H. Barney, Center, Colo.
 Robert U. Barrowclough, Newark, N.J.
 Douglas E. Bartlett, Commack, N.Y.
 E. H. Bassler, New Bremen, Ohio
 Loyd A. Bates, Shepherdstown, W. Va.
 Richard Bauer, Staten Island, N.Y.
 Alvin J. Beachy, Souderton, Pa.
 Joseph C. Beavon, Jr., Barbourville, Ky.
 Edwin R. Beck, West Hilton, Ohio
 Lawrence E. Beebe, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Leonard I. Beerman, Los Angeles.
 Edwin E. Beers, Madison, Wis.
 Birt Beers, Quincy, Mich.
 C. Edward Behre, Silver Spring, Md.
 Edwin de F. Bennett, Houston, Tex.
 Gordon C. Bennett, Merion Station, Pa.
 Albert A. Bentley, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
 Lloyd A. Berg, Bronx, N.Y.
 Philip Berrigan, SSJ, Baltimore, Md.
 Louis Bertoni, Vermilion, O.
 Lee James Beynon, Jr., Rochester, N.Y.
 Charles M. Bieber, Hummelstown, Pa.
 Vernon Bigler, Syracuse, N.Y.
 Lester H. Bill, South Bend, Ind.
 B. Stanley Bittinger, Kingsville, Tex.
 Charles H. Bixby, West Henrietta, N.Y.
 Elizabeth Bixby, Jamestown, N.Y.
 Donald K. Blackie, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Myles D. Blanchard, Monson, Mass.
 Robert I. Blakesley, Shaker Heights, Ohio
 George Blau, Decatur, Ga.
 Robert M. Bock, Hollywood, Calif.
 Robert W. Bockstruck, Louisville, Ky.
 Paul John Bode, St. Louis, Mo.
 Leslie Eugene Bogan, Allentown, Pa.
 Milton Bohmfalk, Del Rio, Tex.
 Ernest J. Bohn, Goshen, Ind.
 Paul F. Boller, Malverne, N.Y.
 Theodore W. Boltz, West Hartford, Conn.
 Arthur E. Bomers, Bakersfield, Calif.
 Charles M. Bond, Lewisburg, Pa.
 Charles W. Bonner, Kearney, N.J.
 O. E. Bonny, Topeka, Kans.
 Sister M. C. Borromeo, CSC, Notre Dame, Ind.
 Lloyd Boshart, Lowville, N.Y.
 Bill Bosler, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Ronald L. Boswell, Craig, Neb.
 Emory Lee Bithast, Keene, N.H.
 Robert D. Botley, Burlingame, Calif.
 Clement Boutgrager, Raleigh, N.C.
 Frank A. Boutwell, Pasadena, Tex.
 Glenn H. Bowlby, Laverne, Calif.
 Fred F. Bowman, Dayton, Va.
 Harold L. Bowser, Union Bridge, Md.
 Lee O. Boye, Tazewell, Va.
 Richard V. Boylan, Fresno, Calif.
 Roger V. Boyvey, Oakland, Calif.
 Howard Box, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Orla E. Bradford, South Bend, Ind.
 John W. Bradley, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Donald O. Brady, Honor, Mich.
 James A. Braker, Kingston, N.Y.
 J. Kenneth Brand, Warren, Mich.
 Wilbur R. Brandt, Paterson, N.J.
 Frank M. Branno, Jr., Madison, N.J.
 Robert M. Brashares, La Habra, Calif.
 Donald E. Bratton, Rocky Mount, N.C.
 H. Myron Braun, Austin, Tex.
 Richard H. Bready, Georgetown, Conn.
 Alan R. Bragg, Swanton, Vt.
 Bradley B. Brehmer, Denver, Colo.
 Ray B. Bressler, Ellinwood, Kans.
 Charles T. Brewster, Honolulu.
 William M. Briggs, Chicago, Ill.
 Robert L. Bromley, Louisiana, Mo.
 George Douglas Brown, Palo Alto, Calif.
 James R. Brown, Corpus Christi, Tex.
 W. Paul Brown, Hannibal, Ohio.
 W. G. Browning, Sylvis, Ill.
 H. C. Brubaker, Saginaw, Mich.
 Robert C. Brubaker, Brighton, Mich.
 Daniel M. Brumbaugh, Saxton, Pa.
 Leonard J. Brummett, Columbia, Mo.
 Monk Bryan, Columbus, Mo.
 J. Ernest Bryant, Boston, Mass.
 Walter E. Bucher, Canton, Ill.
 Ben F. Buckinham, Prairie City, Iowa.
 Robert C. Buckley, Hempstead, N.Y.
 Hartzell Buckner, Auburn, Calif.
 Leonard H. Budd, Stow, Ohio.
 Gerard Bugge, Suffield, Conn.
 N. Ellsworth Bunce, Baltimore, Md.
 Dodds B. Bunch, Sunnysvale, Calif.
 Richard L. Burgess, Laurel, Nebr.
 Maurice Glynn Burke, Columbia, Mo.
 John W. Burkholder, Lancaster County, Pa.
 Clement Burns, New Haven, Conn.
 Russell Burris, Santa Ana, Calif.
 Ina E. Burton, Maywood, Ill.
 John C. Bush, Americus, Kans.
 Jackson L. Butler, Modesto, Calif.
 Jay Butler, Jr., Sharon, Pa.
 William T. Butterfield, Staples, Minn.
 Very Rev. John V. Butler, New York, N.Y.
 L. A. Bangerter, Fairborn, Ohio.
 H. D. Bollinger, Nashville, Tenn.
 Harold Z. Bomberger, McPherson, Kans.
 George W. Brighton, Stratford, Iowa.
 Walter P. Brockway, Exeter, N.H.
 Dale W. Brown, Oak Brook, Ill.
 Albert W. Buck, Chicago, Ill.
 Joe Riley Burns, El Dorado, Kans.
 Lee Vaughn Barker, Oakland, Calif.
 William F. Baur, Stony Point, N.Y.
 Roger S. Boraas, East Orange, N.J.
 Rabbi Stanley R. Brav, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Harold J. Bass, Tacoma, Wash.
 Howard D. Baumgart, Sumner, Wash.
 Lavin B. Bayler, Hinckley, Ill.
 Robert F. Beach, New York, N.Y.
 Robert E. Beck, Russellville, Ind.
 Robert W. Beggs, Ithaca, N.Y.
 Joseph W. Bell, Nashville, Tenn.
 Harry L. Bennett, Washington, D.C.
 Ronald A. Beverlin, Elkton, Md.
 Neil F. Bintz, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Paul Boecler, Milford, Ohio.
 James W. Bristah, Detroit, Mich.
 George G. Brooks, Burlington, Iowa.
 John R. Bross, Billings, Mont.
 Edwin A. Brown, Berea, Ohio.
 J. Thompson Brown, Lexington, Va.
 J. H. Bruemmer, Grand Island, N.Y.
 Paul H. Burditt, Westbrook, Maine.
 Francis A. Beloto, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Rabbi Herbert Bronstein, Rochester, N.Y.
 Jackson Burns, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
 The Ven. C. D. Brawdwood, Lapeer, Mich.
 Prof. Carl Bangs, Kansas City, Mo.
 George C. Beebe, Lakeside, Ohio.
 B. J. Black, Sandusky, Ohio.
 Prof. D. W. Brown, Jamestown, N. Dak.
 Prof. Kenneth Brown, Manchester, Ind.
 Prof. Herbert C. Burke, Collegeville, Minn.
 Prof. G. Murray Brauch, Atlanta, Ga.
 Edward A. Cahill, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Terry Cain, Greenwood, Neb.
 Maurice Caldwell, Anderson, Ind.
 Raymond Calkins, Belmont, Mass.
 Raoul C. Calkins, Dayton, Ohio
 A. W. Campbell, Somerset, Ky.
 Charles G. Campbell, Norwalk, Conn.
 Colin Campbell, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich.
 J. Warren Campbell, Edwards, Mo.
 Ralph J. Capolungo, Oakland, Calif.
 Fred Cappuccino, Takoma Park, Md.
 Erland E. Carson, Escanaba, Mich.
 Milton S. Carothers, Covington, Va.
 J. Russell Carpenter, Pine City, N.Y.
 Clyde Carter, Midland, Va.
 Robert L. Carter, Shelby, N.C.
 William I. Carter, Benton Harbor, Mich.
 Donald L. Carver, Moline, Iowa.
 G. Arthuh Casaday, Palo Alto, Calif.
 Elwood E. Case, Schaghticoke, N.Y.
 J. R. Case, Vergennes, Vt.
 Estell R. Casebler, Louisville, Ky.
 Harry L. Casey, Ardmore, Pa.
 David G. Cassie, Providence, R.I.
 Marid A. Cestaro, Jaffrey, N.H.
 James N. Chumbley, Jr., Woodward, Okla.
 Prof. D. R. Chandler, Washington, D.C.
 Eben T. Chapman, Woodbury, Conn.
 J. Howard Cherry, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 James O. Childs, Norton, Va.
 Charles J. Chipman, Abilene, Kans.
 Paul E. Chreiman, Newtown, Pa.
 Jonn P. Christensen, Barre, Vt.
 Tom H. Christensen, Royal Oak, Mich.
 C. W. Christman, Jr., Hudson, N.Y.
 John Christoff, Lima, Ohio.
 Prof. K. E. Christopherson, Tacoma, Wash.
 Luther K. Clare, Erie, Pa.
 Clarence H. Clark, York, Maine.
 Gordon M. Clark, Johnsonville, N.Y.
 Jack Clark, Laconia, N.H.
 Bishop M. K. Clarke, Washington, D.C.
 William R. Clark, Moran, Kans.
 George V. Claus, Portland, Oreg.
 Kenneth D. Claypool, Seattle, Wash.
 Marvin E. Clingenpeel, Smithville, Ohio.
 C. Donald Close, Pratt, Kans.
 John I. Coffman, Pomona, Calif.
 Rabbi Jehudah M. Cohen, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Rabbi Hillel Cohn, San Bernardino, Calif.
 John H. Cole, Seelyville, Ind.
 Jordan Cole, Schuylerville, N.Y.
 George L. Collins, San Jose, Calif.
 J. J. Collins, Newton, Ala.
 George D. Colman, Detroit, Mich.
 William H. Compton, Port St. Lucie, Fla.
 J. Elliott Corbett, Washington, D.C.
 Pablo Cotto, New York, N.Y.
 Ray H. Cowen, Chester, N.H.
 Robert M. Cox, Rye, N.Y.
 Martha A. Cox, Rye, N.Y.
 Thomas B. Cox, McLean, Va.
 Robert B. Craig, Muncie, Kans.
 Harry S. Crede, Peoria, Ill.
 Edna L. Crede, Peoria, Ill.
 Henry D. Crede, Roseville, Ill.
 George Crenshaw, Steubenville, Ohio.
 Tom O. Crosby, Jr., Bossien City, La.
 Charles F. Crist, Canonsburg, Pa.
 Tom O. Crosby, Jr., Bossien City, La.
 Prof. John P. Crossley, Jr., Hastings, Nebr.
 Walter B. Crowell, Ione, Oreg.
 Donald J. Cunningham, Redwood City, Calif.
 John M. Currie, Easton, Pa.
 Sister Helen Carey, Nauvoo, Ill.
 Marion Casey, Belle Plaine, Minn.
 Franklin K. Cassel, Littitz, Pa.
 Wallace Cedarleaf, Sidney, N.Y.
 Rabbi Arthur A. Chiel, New Haven, Conn.
 Robert T. Clark, Denver, Colo.
 Arden Clute, Mountainview, Calif.
 Martin J. Corbin, Tivoli, N.Y.
 Thomas C. Cornell, New York, N.Y.
 Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit, Mich.

Vivian Crossman, Honolulu, Hawaii.
W. Lynn Crowding, Carlisle, Pa.
Kevin Culligan, Milwaukee, Wis.
Gale D. Crumrine, Troy, Ohio.
M. E. Cunningham, Nashville, Tenn.
Harold A. Clark, Clarissa, Minn.
William G. Coxhead, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Donald S. Campbell, Myrtle Creek, Oreg.
Thomas M. Carson, Denver, Colo.
George P. Carter, San Mateo, Calif.
Paul E. Chreiman, Newtown, Pa.
W. R. Callaway, Cumming, Ga.
Charles B. Curran, Washington, D.C.
Prof. William Case, Kansas City, Mo.
Prof. Russel J. Compton, Greencastle, Ind.
Prof. Carl W. Condit, Morton Grove, Ill.
Elmer L. Dadisman, Astoria, Ill.
Arthur R. Daes, Otisco, Ind.
Gordon E. Dalbeck, Flagstaff, Ariz.
James P. Dale, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Leroy M. Dancer, Bainbridge, N.Y.
Alex E. Dandar, Elyria, Ohio.
John Irving Daniel, Franklin, Mass.
Wilbur O. Daniel, Pearl River, N.Y.
Prof. John W. Darr, Seattle, Wash.
David G. Davis, Limmath, Colo.
E. Julius Davis, Parlier, Calif.
Harry B. Davis, Kansas City, Mo.
Jack A. Davis, Orlando, Fla.
S. Kenneth Davis, Daytona Beach, Fla.
Albert Edward Day, Falls Church, Va.
A. Garnett Day, Jr., Indianapolis, Ind.
Ben F. Day, Rockford, Ill.
LeRoy Day, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
George W. Deaton, Claypool, Ind.
Purd E. Deitz, New York, N.Y.
Charles A. DeLay, Gilman, Ill.
Douglas Denton, North Weymouth, Mass.
Kermit H. Derstine, Akron, Pa.
Clarence R. Desler, Clatskanie, Oreg.
Oviatt E. Desmond, Indianapolis, Ind.
Charles De Vries, Harwich, Mass.
Rhoda Jane Dickinson, Minneapolis, Minn.
Albert A. Dickson, Spencerport, N.Y.
Elmer A. Dickson, Ashton, Ill.
Theodore Dixon, Simsbury, Conn.
Paul H. Doering, Loyal, Wis.
Carroll A. Doggett, Jr., Rockville, Md.
Herbert L. D. Doggett, Silver Spring, Md.
Harlow Phelps Donovan, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.
John E. Donovan, Des Moines, Iowa.
H. P. Doran, Apros, Calif.
M. E. Dorr, Fairfax, Va.
James B. Douglas, Richmond, Va.
Robert E. Doxey, Binghamton, N.Y.
Francis A. Drake, Schroon Lake, N.Y.
M. Richard Drake, Cleveland, Ohio.
Allen E. Dripps, Rochester, Minn.
William H. DuBay, Santa Monica, Calif.
Wilton J. Dubrick, Binghamton, N.Y.
Paul H. Duckwall, Statesville, N.C.
Bert Logan Duncan, Traverse City, Mich.
T. E. Dunlap, Sr., Green Bank, W. Va.
James S. Duren, Menomonee Falls, Wis.
G. Eugene Durham, Ithaca, N.Y.
C. L. Duxbury, Kansas City, Mo.
John Dykstra, Locust Valley, N.Y.
Claude F. Dadisman, San Diego, Calif.
Richard J. Davey, Rochester, N.Y.
Lewis H. Davis, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.
Paul F. Davis, Corvallis, Oreg.
Jesse De Witt, Royal Oak, Mich.
Walter Dolde, Tloga, Ill.
Glenn A. Dunn, Westfield, Wis.
Prof. William E. David, Athens, Ga.
Norman Dewire, Detroit, Mich.
Joel Duffield, Hamilton, Ill.
E. Dale Dunlap, Kansas City, Mo.
J. Stanley Earhart, Mechanicsburg, Pa.
Riggins R. Earl, Jr., Nashville, Tenn.
Robert Ebey, Argos, Ind.
Thomas H. Eck, Rockford, Ill.
Robert M. Eddy, Farmington, Mich.
Rabbi Jason Z. Edelstein, Pitcairn, Pa.
Robert A. Edgar, New York, N.Y.
Prof. George R. Edwards, Louisville, Ky.
J. Edgar Edwards, Ann Arbor, Mich.
William C. Eicher, Rocky Mount, Va.
Charles W. Eichman, Hope, Ind.

John Elder, Waverly, Ohio
M. W. Elftmann, Kenosha, Wis.
Al Burton Eliason, Fond du Lac, Wis.
Richard F. Elliott, Jr., Clemson, S.C.
Thomas E. Ellis, Camarillo, Calif.
Charles A. Ellwood, West Liberty, W. Va.
George F. Emery, Springfield, Ill.
J. Martin England, Greenville, S.C.
Frank W. Engstrom, Natoma, Kans.
Kenneth L. Engstrom, Buffalo, Wyo.
Herman Ensslin, Waynesburg, Ky.
Fred Erion, Audubon, Pa.
Gerald Eslinger, Shelton, Iowa
Edgar J. Evans, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rowland H. Evans, Mazomarie, Wis.
William M. Everhart, Ashboro, N.C.
M. Jones Egan, New York, N.Y.
Richard Ehrenberg, Leonard, N. Dak.
Rabbi Harry Essrig, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rabbi Randall M. Falk, Nashville, Tenn.
Lyman G. Farrar, Westbury, Long Island, N.Y.
Dean L. Farringer, Columbus, Ohio.
Frank Favalora, McFarland, Calif.
R. A. Feenstra, Falls City, Oreg.
Rabbi Alexander Feinsilver, Easton, Pa.
Raymond A. Fenner, Birmingham, Mich.
J. Frank Ferguson, Cincinnati, Ohio
Harlo H. Ferris, Waterloo, Iowa.
Emerson S. Fike, Blue Ridge, Va.
Galen E. Fike, Eglon, W. Va.
Lester E. Fike, Ashley, Ind.
Oscar R. Fike, Bellwood, Pa.
Paul H. Fike, Weyers Cove, Va.
Kenneth A. Fineran, Frakes, Ky.
W. W. Finlator, Raleigh, N.C.
Thomas M. Finn, C.S.P., Washington, D.C.
Carleton M. Fisher, Massapequa, N.Y.
E. R. Fisher, Lansing, Mich.
Geo. L. Fitzgerald, New Haven, Conn.
William J. Fitzpatrick, Detroit, Mich.
J. Emery Fleming, Jr., Tokyo, Japan.
Daniel C. Flory, Peru, Ind.
Edgar Flory, New Preston, Conn.
Raymond C. Flory, Paradise, Calif.
Wendell Flory, Waynesboro, Va.
Williston M. Ford, O.S.L., San Diego, Calif.
Robert E. Forester, Loyal, Ky.
Charles W. Forman, New Haven, Conn.
James E. Forrest, Mobile, Ala.
Robert Forsberg, New Haven, Conn.
Gerald E. Forshey, Chicago, Ill.
Rabbi Stephen Forstein, Richmond, Calif.
Fred E. Fox, Mount Vernon, Wash.
Donald L. Frank, Eau Claire, Wis.
Howard G. Franklin, Jamesburg, N.J.
Dean L. Frantz, North Manchester, Ind.
Ira H. Frantz, Delphi, Ind.
Delton Franz, Chicago, Ill.
Harold R. Fray, Jr., Newborn, Mass.
Porter French, Chester, Ill.
Edward S. Frey, New York, N.Y.
E. A. Fridell, Berkeley, Calif.
Gerhard Friesen, Newton, Kans.
James E. Friesner, Sr., Bankin, Ill.
Harold I. Frost, Auburn, Maine.
Leota T. Frye, Sandlake, Mich.
J. Alfred Fryer, Madison, Wis.
Clifford F. Fugate, Huntington Park, Calif.
Clarence G. Fuller, Jr., New Orleans, La.
Clyde Funkhouser, Lebanon, Ill.
Norman J. Faramelli, Philadelphia, Pa.
W. H. Ferry, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Herbert A. Fisher, Kettering, Ohio.
Byron M. Flory, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
Walter J. Fox, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Richard E. French, Auburndale, Mass.
Marion C. Frenyear, Unadilla, N.Y.
Prof. Gilbert S. Fell, Navesink, N.J.
Rabbi Henry Fisch, West Orange, N.J.
Rabbi Frank A. Fischer, Athens, Ga.
Allan R. Fisher, Grand Marais, Minn.
Charles F. Frederick, Gray, Maine.
John Fragale, Jr., Warwick, N.Y.
Prof. W. Arthur Faus, Williamsport, Pa.
Harlan M. Frost, Buffalo, N.Y.
Richard M. A. Gadow, Fairport Harbor, Ohio.
James S. Gadsden, Camden, S.C.
Erwin A. Gaede, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bradford E. Gale, Quincy, Mass.

Rabbi Hillel, Gamoran, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
Dwight Ganzel, Waverly, Nebr.
Bruce W. Garner, Hancock, Mich.
Curt Garrett, Roselle, N.J.
Karl C. Garrison, Jr., Durham, N.C.
Allen H. Gates, Hatfield, Mass.
John H. Gebhart, Marathon, Fla.
Frank Gehman, Klamath, Calif.
Harmon M. Gehr, Pasadena, Calif.
Vance Geier, Los Angeles, Calif.
H. Robert Gemmer, Whitesboro, N.Y.
J. H. Gerberdins, Denver, Colo.
Ira W. Gibbel, Newport News, Va.
Pius Gible, Tipp City, Ohio.
O. E. Gibson, Westmont, Ill.
R. John Gibson, Rapid City, S. Dak.
Bruce E. Gideon, Wilmette, Ill.
Wm. A. Gilbert, Ventura, Calif.
David A. Giles, New York, N.Y.
Malcolm E. Gillespie, Carbondale, Ill.
Philip H. Gillis, Amsterdam, Ohio.
Robert Gilman, Milton-Freewater, Oreg.
Aaron S. Gilmartin, Walnut Creek, Calif.
Paul J. Gilmer, Institute, W. Va.
William E. Gilpin, Little Falls, N.Y.
C. Homer Ginn, Middleboro, Mass.
Dennis E. Glad, Chicago, Ill.
Glenn D. Glazier, West Brookfield, Mass.
Charles Glenn, Roxbury, Mass.
W. Herbert Glenn, Vernon, Mass.
Irving R. Glover, Canton, Ohio.
Theodore S. Gooley, Wells, Maine.
Prof. John D. Godsey, Madison, N.J.
Robert E. Goessling, Owen, Wis.
Rabbi Robert E. Goldberg, Hamden, Conn.
Rabbi Abram Vossen Goodman, Lawrence, N.Y.
Quentin A. Goodrich, Elk Grove Village, Ill.
John Goodwin, S. Nyack, N.Y.
William M. Goodwin, Muscle Shoals, Ala.
Clifford H. Goold, Portland, Oreg.
Robert W. Gordon, E. St. Louis, Ill.
John W. Gosnell, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Prof. Norman K. Gottwald, Newton Center, Mass.
Harvey Graber, Topeka, Ind.
O'Ray C. Graber, Oklahoma City.
Grover C. Graham, Spruce Pine, N.C.
Don Gaymon, Manhattan, Kans.
Rabbi Sidney Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.
Albert Greene, Sayre, Pa.
Donald Greenough, Harrisburg, S. Dak.
Paul Ray, Greenwood, Sherrodsville, Ohio.
A. Ray Grummon, Springfield, Ill.
Kenneth Griswold, Minneapolis, Minn.
Malcolm Grobe, W. Lebanon, N.H.
Wilbur D. Grose, Minneapolis, Minn.
Thomas E. Guerdat, Randolph, N.Y.
Chester L. Guinn, Emmetsburg, Iowa.
David Gustafson, Kanakake, Ill.
Robert Gardiner, Wellesley, Mass.
Laurence Garrett, Stuart, Iowa.
E. L. Gass, Mountain Grove, Mo.
Raymond H. Giffin, Minneapolis, Minn.
Richard S. Gilbert, Ithaca, N.Y.
Rabbi Jerrold Goldstein, St. Paul, Minn.
Floyd Gotien, Silver Creek, N.Y.
Ellis Graber, Minneapolis, Minn.
Robert E. Grant, Suffern, N.Y.
John Paul Griffith, Bernardsville, N.J.
Thomas A. Grimm, Albany, Calif.
Rabbi, Everett Gendler, Princeton, N.J.
Dr. Ira E. Gillet, Portland, Oreg.
Eugene H. Haaf, Hampton Bays, N.Y.
Dennis W. Haas, Lancaster, Pa.
Dwight Haberman, Ortonville, Minn.
Carl C. Hackman, Richmond, Mo.
Rosco F. Haning, Alexandria, Minn.
Gary L. Hakes, Syracuse, N.Y.
Tom G. Haley, Van Alstyne, Tex.
Cameron P. Hall, Garden City, N.Y.
David C. Hall, South Norwalk, Conn.
R. F. Hall, Elyria, Ohio.
Willard B. Hall, Harrington, Wash.
Arthur A. Tamann, Leon, Iowa
L. M. Hamby, Grafton, Mass.
P. M. Hammond, Portland, Oreg.
Robert A. Hammond, Ballston Spa, N.Y.

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

923

Bernie H. Hampton, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Emerson G. Hangen, Long Beach, Calif.
 George Hangen, Reseda, Calif.
 Ray E. Hankins, Exeter, Nebr.
 Walter W. Hannum, Juneau, Alaska
 Carl A. Hansen, Minneapolis, Minn.
 James H. Hanson, Glendive, Mont.
 Vernon R. Hanson, Medford, Oreg.
 George Haram, Flora, Ill.
 Arthur L. Hardy, Kansas City, Kans.
 Ira R. Harkins, Tiffin, Ohio
 Chester I. Harley, West Milton, Ohio
 Frederick F. Harlins, Somerville, Mass.
 Herman Harmelink III, North Bergen, N.J.
 John J. Harmon, Roxbury, Mass.
 Lyle E. Harper, Walkersville, Md.
 J. P. Harriman, Bellingham, Wash.
 Ernest S. Harris, Jr., Hartford, Conn.
 Gerald F. Harris, Elmira, N.Y.
 Robert A. Harris, Celina, Ohio
 W. Reid Harris, Hickory, N.C.
 Thomas O. Harrison, Lexington, Ky.
 Norman L. Harsh, Staunton, Va.
 J. Richard Hart, Stockton, Calif.
 Marvin J. Hartman, St. Joseph, Mich.
 Vartan Hartunian, Belmont, Mass.
 L. H. R. Hass, Washington, D.C.
 Roy Allan Hassel, New Platz, N.Y.
 Glenn O. Hassinger, Myerstown, Pa.
 Clabourne Hatcher, Columbia Falls, Mont.
 Albert M. Haight, Mount Union, Pa.
 Francis C. Hawes, Manchester, Conn.
 Percy R. Hayden, Concord, N.H.
 Edward H. Hayes, North Stonington, Conn.
 Paul G. Hayes, Minneapolis, Minn.
 C. Douglas Hayward, Berkeley, Calif.
 R. W. Haywood III, Kingsville, Tex.
 Prof. Lowell B. Hazzard, Washington, D.C.
 H. Lee Hebel, Karthaus, Pa.
 Raymond W. Hedberg, St. Paul, Minn.
 Sam Hedrick, Newton Center, Mass.
 Norval Hegland, Philip, S. Dak.
 Matthias R. Hellig, Mount Gretna, Pa.
 Gerald G. Hellman, Baltimore, Md.
 Edward K. Heininger, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Walter J. Helsey, Tiffin, Ohio.
 Arthur G. Heisler, Columbia City, Ind.
 DeWitt F. Heim, Kenly, N.C.
 Robert A. Helstrom, Claysville, Pa.
 Kenneth R. Hemphill, Manhattan, Kans.
 C. L. Hendrix, Elkhart, Ind.
 Walter F. Hendricks, Jr., Richmond, Va.
 M. Miles Henry, Marion, Kans.
 H. Eugene Herr, Scottsdale, Pa.
 Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, Detroit, Mich.
 Robert E. Heskett, Roslindale, Mass.
 Robert G. Hess, Goldendale, Wash.
 D. Russell Hetsler, Alhambra, Calif.
 Lorton G. Heusel, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Clare B. Hewitt, Poplar Grove, Ill.
 Gerald C. Hibbard, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Richard R. Hicks, Chestertown, Md.
 Anne Higgins, North Haven, Conn.
 Clarence M. Higgins, Jr., Stone Creek, Ohio.
 G. Truett High, Duluth, Minn.
 William A. Highfield, Mountaintop, Pa.
 Dean E. Hill, Weedsport, N.Y.
 Gordon W. Hill, Northampton, Mass.
 Robert W. Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Melvin Himes, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Frank T. Hiroms, Wahpeton, N. Dak.
 Philip D. Hirtzel, Mason, Mich.
 Sam Hochstatter.
 P. Stein Hockman, Romney, W. Va.
 Violet Hodges, Montana, Calif.
 George A. Hodgkins, Stratford, Conn.
 Elmer H. Hoerer, St. Louis, Mo.
 Gilbert E. Hoffman, Sharon, Pa.
 Wayne M. Hoffman, Luverne, Minn.
 Rodney D. Hokenson, Hancock, Mich.
 Ralph M. Holdeman, New York.
 Benj. R. Hollis, Keosauqua, Iowa.
 Donald G. Holsopple, Lansing, Mich.
 Reynold N. Hoover, Flagler Beach, Fla.
 Harold Hornberger, Red Bank, N.J.
 Laurence M. Horst, Evanston, Ill.
 Robert Horton, Trevoise, Pa.
 Wright M. Horton, Galesburg, Kans.
 J. J. Hostetler, Peoria, Ill.
 Robert E. Houff, Harrisonburg, Va.

W. Donald Houser, Cattaraugus, N.Y.
 Robert W. Hovda, Washington, D.C.
 Ernest L. Howard, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Lee A. Howe, Schenectady, N.Y.
 Robert M. Howes, Kennebunkport, Maine.
 Paul C. Hoyt, Shokan, N.Y.
 William Huckabone, Corydon, Ind.
 John L. Hudson, Northlake, Ill.
 Kenneth de P. Hughes, Cambridge, Mass.
 James David Hulett, Claremont, Calif.
 George M. Hunt, Henry, Ill.
 Allan A. Hunter, Claremont, Calif.
 Donald F. Hursh, Meyersdale, Pa.
 Paul L. Huscher, Strawberry Point, Iowa.
 Horace Huse, Logansport, Ind.
 Jack Hustad, Overland Park, Kans.
 David Hykes, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
 Dale Hylton, Westminster, Md.
 John Harrell, Berkeley, Calif.
 Wayne L. Harting, Butler, N.J.
 Guy C. Heyl, Rock Hill, S.C.
 Eugene W. Hibbard, Manson, Wash.
 Geo. A. Hickson, Bellevue, Ohio.
 Alberta Hilditch, Benton, Ill.
 Dean E. Hill, Weedsport, N.Y.
 Donald Robert Hoff, Monroe, Conn.
 Everett R. Hunt, Tacoma, Wash.
 Donald C. Hanson, Syracuse, N.Y.
 Albert E. Hartman, Trenton, N.J.
 Prof. Hideo Hashimoto, Portland, Oreg.
 Anna E. Koglin, Thief River Falls, Minn.
 Rabbi Isadore B. Hoffman, N.Y.
 Prof. Yates Hafner, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
 James F. Hopewell, Pomona, N.Y.
 Charles W. Iglehart, Dunedin, Fla.
 Bothan T. Ilwell, Fort Lewis, Ohio.
 Wilder V. Immel, Santa Cruz, Calif.
 Bruce O. Inglis, Mojave, Calif.
 Robert W. Inglis, Denver, Colo.
 Deane W. Irish, LaCrosse, Wis.
 Jerold L. Irvin, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Edwin F. Irwin, Sacramento, Calif.
 Earl Jabay, Princeton, N.J.
 Charles H. Jack, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Patrick A. Jackson, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Richard H. Jackson, Mora, Minn.
 Richard L. Jackson, Durham, N.C.
 Warren E. Jackson, Vermontville, Mich.
 Herman M. Janssen, Marlette, Mich.
 Harold A. Jayne, Portage, Mich.
 Loe E. Jeanbey, Muscatine, La.
 Alan Jenkins, Royal Oaks, Mich.
 David W. Jenks, Tuxedo, N.Y.
 Joseph R. Jennings, Fresno, Calif.
 Harold V. Jensen, Santa Monica, Calif.
 Warren E. Jensen, Ware, Mass.
 Richard A. Johnsen, Middleburgh, N.Y.
 Brace E. Johnson, Sterling, Ill.
 Charles E. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Herman C. Johnson, Cambridge, Mass.
 J. H. Johnson, Ferndale, Mich.
 Roy A. Johnson, Elizabethtown, Pa.
 W. L. Johnson, Tacoma, Wash.
 Berwyn E. Jones, Kouts, Ind.
 Jack E. Jones, Shelbyville, Ind.
 J. Ira Jones, Lima, Ohio.
 Laurence R. Jones, Oak Brook, Ill.
 Richard E. Jones, New Albany, Ind.
 Charles Wesley Jordan, Chicago, Ill.
 Donald R. Jordan, Elgin, Ill.
 Correll M. Julian, Walnut Creek, Calif.
 Hershey Julien, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
 Andrew Juvinall, San Francisco, Calif.
 William M. Justice, Stony Point, N.Y.
 Augusta T. Jackley, Ogden, Utah.
 Francis Johnson, Jr., League City, Tex.
 Major L. Johnson, Weathersfield, Conn.
 Clarence Jordan, Americus, Ga.
 Donald E. Jordan, Fresno, Calif.
 W. O. Johnson, Elmhurst, Ill.
 Rabbi Wolfi Kaetzel, Long Beach, Calif.
 Frederick F. Kaetzel, Mitchell, Ind.
 Dean Ragarise, New Windsor, Md.
 Dean C. Kallander, Oxford, Ohio.
 Rabbi D. L. Kaplan, Needham Heights, Mass.
 Rabbi Samuel E. Karff.
 Calvin R. Kaufman, South Bend, Ind.
 Bishop Nelson E. Kaufman, Elkhart, Ind.
 Robert W. Kauffman, Waupun, Wis.
 Stewart B. Kauffman, Huntingdon, Pa.

L. Robert Keck, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Harold R. Keen, Ottawa, Ill.
 Christian H. Kehl, San Antonio, Tex.
 Arthur C. Kelm, Pomona, Calif.
 Howard H. Kelm, Peoria, Ill.
 D. Howard Kelper, Lititz, Pa.
 Richard A. Kellaway, New Bedford, Mass.
 Walter E. Kellison, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
 Max V. Kemling, Paw Paw, Ill.
 J. Paul Kendall, Kokomo, Ind.
 Harold M. Kenep, Clearville, Pa.
 Alick, M. Kennedy, Clinton, N.J.
 George T. Kennedy, Athens, Ohio.
 Hazel M. Kennedy, Elgin, Ill.
 Roger Kennedy, Green Springs, Ohio.
 LeRoy Kennel, Lombard, Ill.
 Richard Kern, Findlay, Ohio.
 Earl Kernahan, Chula Vista, Calif.
 Erwin K. Kerr, McKean, Pa.
 Howard A. Kerstetter, Baltimore, Md.
 Donald A. Kessler, Wichita, Kans.
 Milton G. Kessler, Cape Cod, Mass.
 Phillip G. Kessler, North Manchester, Ind.
 Delbert W. Kettering, Sheffield Lake, Ohio.
 Russell W. Klester, St. John, Kans.
 S. Collins Kilburn, Raleigh, N.C.
 Paul E. Killinger, Orange, Calif.
 Carl E. Kime, Battle Creek, Mich.
 Dean Kindy, Creston, Ohio.
 David S. King, Amherst, Mass.
 Deaconess Dellema J. King, Pierre, S. Dak.
 Horace M. King, San Antonio, Tex.
 Jack K. King, Northport, N.Y.
 James Wilbur King, Bagley, Iowa.
 Thomas Moore King, Sioux City, Iowa.
 David C. Kinnard, St. Louis, Mo.
 Glenn E. Kinsel, Hanover, Pa.
 Alvin L. Kintner, Marlon, Ind.
 Homer Kirdcofe, Plymouth, Ind.
 David Kirk, Wheeling, W. Va.
 Dean R. Kirkwood, Oakland, Calif.
 Stanley P. Kirn, Sr., Cass City, Mich.
 Scott D. Kittredge, Wiscasset, Maine.
 Gerhard Klassen, Fairfield, Pa.
 LeRoy H. Klaus, Stillwater, Minn.
 Voigt Kleckley, Atlanta, Ga.
 Ralph G. Kleen, San Bernardino, Calif.
 M. B. Klepinger, Dayton, Ohio.
 Robert E. Klingel, Carey, Ohio.
 George H. Klock, Northville, N.Y.
 A. W. Klumb, Moonee, Ill.
 Charles P. Knight, Ottawa, Kans.
 Edwin L. Knopf, Mariette, Mich.
 John G. Koehler, Wakefield, Mass.
 Robert W. Koenig, Terre Haute, Ind.
 James H. Konrad, Fremont, Ohio.
 William Koshewa, New Albany, Ind.
 Charles F. Kraft, Evanston, Ill.
 Aba Krause, Henderson, Nebr.
 C. W. Kremer, Bridgeton, N.J.
 Burl G. Kreps, Greeley, Colo.
 Eugene William Kreyes, Naperville, Ill.
 Timothy J. Kribs, Harrisburg, Oreg.
 Allen E. Kroehler, Lancaster, Pa.
 Rabbi Charles A. Kroloff, Westbury, N.Y.
 James F. Kubik, Half Moon Bay, Calif.
 Rabbi Harold L. Kudan, Glencoe, Ill.
 Wm. F. Kuechmann, Walnut, Iowa.
 Ralph L. Kuetner, Manchester, Mich.
 Howard R. Kunkle, Fort Scott, Kans.
 Gordon F. Kurtz, Rochester, N.Y.
 H. E. Kettering, Greenville, Ohio.
 D. Franklin Kohl, Great Falls, Mont.
 Rabbi Pesach Krauss, Woonsocket, R.I.
 A. V. Krebs, Jr., San Francisco, Calif.
 John A. Kruse, Eau Claire, Wis.
 Arthur L. Lacey, Ilion, N.Y.
 R. Gwinn Lacy, Versailles, Ohio.
 Arnold R. Lambarth, St. Claire Shores, Mich.
 A. C. Lambert, Fruitland, Idaho.
 Edward H. Lander, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
 Harvey M. Landis, North Manchester, Ind.
 Herman B. Landis, Sunnyside, Wash.
 Alfred P. Landon, Fenton, Mich.
 Richard L. Landrum, Topeka, Kans.
 William P. Langham, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
 E. G. Larson, Ada, Minn.
 Hilmer Larson, Hastings, Nebr.
 E. Edwin Lasbury, Fruitland, Md.

Philip H. Lauver, South Bend, Ind.
 Rabbi Bernard H. Lavine, Evansville, Ind.
 R. D. LaWall, Kasseville, N.Y.
 Earl A. Lawrence, Auburn, Calif.
 Henry H. Lawson, Dallas, Tex.
 Fernando A. Laxamana, Waterman, Ill.
 Richard D. Leach, Gregory, S. Dak.
 Edward L. Lee, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
 James O. Leffingwell, Emporia, Kans.
 Douglas Leffler, Finly, Ind.
 Wilmer M. Lehman, Wiley, Colo.
 Donald E. Leiter, Berwyn, Pa.
 Robert L. Lemon, Richmond, Calif.
 R. Webb Leonard, Middletown, N.J.
 Richard D. Leonard, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi J. Aaron Levy, Sumter, S.C.
 Rabbi Richard N. Levy, New York, N.Y.
 C. Wilburn Lewallen, Nappanee, Ind.
 Duane A. Lewellen, Dayton, Va.
 Donald R. Lewis, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
 Edson T. Lewis, Jr., Hoboken, N.J.
 Henry H. Lewis, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
 Donald Lichtenfeld, Fraser, Mich.
 David H. Lindberg, Waynesburg, Pa.
 Melvin W. Lindberg, Youngstown, Ohio.
 Carl H. Linden, Redwood Falls, Minn.
 Frank A. Lindhorst, Seal Beach, Calif.
 W. C. Link, Jr., Liberty, Mo.
 Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, Washington, D.C.
 Lester E. Loder, Bayside, N.Y.
 Richard E. Lofgren, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Richard D. Logan, Waterbury, Vt.
 Wesley T. Logan, Waterbury, Vt.
 Robert D. Loggie, Harwinton, Conn.
 John G. Lola, Cambridge, Mass.
 James A. Lollis, Lexington, Ky.
 Kenneth G. Long, Perrysburg, Ohio.
 John D. Long, Lancaster, Pa.
 Loy L. Long, Auburn, Mass.
 Norman D. Long, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Alden L. Longwell, Elm Creek, Nebr.
 Charles Edwin Lord, Oakland, Calif.
 Donald G. Lothrop, Boston, Mass.
 James E. Loudermilk, Goleta, Calif.
 Howard Lone, Taunton, Mass.
 Julian Price Love, Louisville, Ky.
 Warren B. Lovejoy, Albion, N.Y.
 Adams Lovekin, LaVerne, Calif.
 Edward F. Lovill, Pulaski, Va.
 Herbert R. Lucas, Middletown, Ohio.
 Randy Lunsford, La Crosse, Wis.
 Prof. Robert E. Luccock, Boston, Mass.
 Paul L. Ludlow, Burley, Idaho.
 Dale Luther, Lockport, Ill.
 William B. Lutz, Mayville, Mich.
 Patrick Lynch, Suffield, Conn.
 Wm. B. Lytle, Clarksville, Ark.
 Bishop Charles W. Long, Tiskilwa, Ill.
 James H. Laird, Detroit, Mich.
 J. Harry Lau, Woodstock, Va.
 John M. Lederach, Hubbard, Oreg.
 Henry V. Lofquist, Wilson, N.C.
 William W. Longenecker, Mount Joy, Pa.
 Richard Lungren, Sacramento, Calif.
 Verne H. Leininger, LaFayette, Ohio.
 Carl H. Lenz, Buffalo, N.Y.
 James S. Leslie, Delaware, Ohio.
 Howard T. Lutz, Eau Claire, Wis.
 Prof. Paul A. Lacey, Richmond, Ind.
 Prof. George Lang, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Prof. William F. Luder, Boston, Mass.

SIGNERS FROM EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, SOUTH AMERICA, AND CANADA

Australia: W. D. Adams, D. J. Andrews, Philip Andrews, Most Reverend G. Appleton, Lewis A. Borm, John Bryant, Frank Byatt, E. G. Clancy, A.M. Clarke, F. M. Combridge, W. R. Cowper, Eric Derbyshire, Alfred M. Dickie, Clyde Dominish, Arthur Ellemor, Leonard G. Forward, H. B. Freeman, Neil Glover, Frank Hartley, S. Henshall, A. C. Holland, A. G. Howse, David L. Hurse, Austin James, T. Lane, John A. Lloyd, R. V. Longthorpe, Dr. Allan W. Loy, J. Luktes, Dr. R. J. Maddox, E. Gwyn Miller, Bishop John S. Moyes, R. Painter, Norman H. Park, R. B. Patterson, R. G. Peterson, R. H. Pethybridge, David J. Pope, Gordon G. Powell, G. R. Riley, W. T. Riley, H. Roberts, H. E. Roland, Neville R. Ross, P. M. Saphin, W. W. Saunders, Bruce

Silverwood, Donald H. Smith, G. C. Smith, Ralph Sutton, A. E. Vogt, Alan Walker, F. W. Whyte, A. R. Wilbrey, E. L. Williams.
 Belgium: Abbe Paul Carrette, Abbe Chapelle, Abbe Georgery, Abbe Joseph Gofinet, Emil Jequier, Andre H. H. Van der Mensbrugghe, P. Tourne.

Canada: Gerald Brown, Richard G. Camridge, Dr. David H. Carr, Rt. Rev. J. C. Feehey, Glenn M. Harmon, Peter B. Moore, K. Barry Passinore, J. C. Thompson.

Chile: Joel Gajardo Valasquez.

Czechoslovakia: Milos Sourek.

Denmark: S. Birke, Enrico Bejerna, Sage Bjirno, Father Borris, B. Christiansen, Im L. Christensen, Robert Christensen, Father Martin Drovsky, C. A. Flannen, Fritz Florin, Idgurd Granlid, Jorgen Hansen, Uffe Hansen, Kell Helmer, Otto Helms, N. R. Hemmingsen, Hardy Højhead K. Keiding, T. C. Kemp, G. Klausen, Bent A. Koch, Olaf Kune, Y. Lund, Ivan Mathiesen, Bent Melchior, Jorgen Nissen, S. Oldenburg, Ole Olsson, Paul Pedersen, N. Y. Raid, Tim Rosenberg, H. Skjerk, K. E. Skydsgaard, Berg Sorensen, G. Sparring-Petersen, Jan Stolt, Immanuel Telter, Marie M. Thulstoup, Gunner Tjaave, Mogens V. Zeuthen.

England: Rabbi Saul Amias, Lucy M. Burt, Edward Carpenter, L. G. Champion, Pennar Davies, H. H. Farmer, Susan Ford, A. Graham Hellier, Anita Hicks, Robin E. Hutt, John Kietty, Kenneth A. Lee, Lewis MacLachlan, Clifford H. Macquire, David Mason, Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Paul Oestreich, Prof. E. Gordon, W. G. Sewell, John Stacey, John Stewart, Stephen Thorne, Dr. John T. Vincent.

Finland: Alexander Kasanko.

France: Edward Theis, Jean Lasserre, Henri Rosser.

Ghana: Emmanuel Sackey Decker.

East Germany: Dr. Dieter Frieblighaus, Martin Kramer.

West Germany: Frank Crusemann, Gunther Danger, Kurt Essen, John R. Priesen, Joachim Gneist, Dr. D. Goldschmidt, Adolf Grau, Friedrich Hutendiek, Dr. Robert Kohl, Siegfried Mebrer, Dr. E. Muller-Gangloff, Otto Oetker, Helmut Pohl, Renate Riemack, Ulricke Schleifenbaum, Alexander Semmelrock, Horst Symanowski, Gerhard Weber, Fritz Weissinger, Gerhard Wessler, Dieter Zimmermann.

Ireland: D. Erwin Strunz.

Italy: Raymond J. Bouley, Michele Foligno, Don Lorenzo Milani, Giorgio Spini, Tullio Vinay, Valdo Vinay.

Japan: J. Emery Flemming, Jr., George H. Theuer.

Netherlands: A. H. E. van Hengel, Mrs. M. M. van Hengel, T. C. C. Scholten, Prof. Dr. H. Kohlbrugge and Miss H. Kohlbrugge, Albert J. Rasker, Jan E. Uitman, H. W. P. Weggen.

Philippines: Abel A. Amago, Justiniano Cajuiat, Prof. Janice B. Deats, Dr. Richard Deats, Francisco Fernandez, W. Cecil Findley, Betty M. Hessel, Dr. Eugene A. Hessel, Marion Kline, J. William Matthews, Jannette E. Newhall.

Scotland: Werner Becher.

Southwest Africa: R. McKenzie Fraser, Norman Gess, Miss Mabel Charlotte Hart, Canon Frank M. Haythornthwaite, Hansie Herrie, Mrs. Cornelia G. Warrington.

Sweden: Andes Akelund, Carl-Gustaf Boethius, Elsa Cedergren, Olov Hartman, John Hedlund, Stiv Jakobson, Bernt Jonsson, Gosta Nicklasson, Dr. Margit Sahlin, Ingmar Strom, Joel Sorenson, Dr. Lars Thunberg, Dr. Anne-Marie Thunberg.

Switzerland: Prof. Samuel Amsler, Prof. Pierre Annen, Lydia von Auw, Pierre Balmer, Hermann Bauler, Willy Benguin, Jean de Benoit, Rodolphe Bergier, Ernest Bernoulli, Francis Berthold, W. Bieder, Giovanni Bogo, Emile Boissonnas, Fritz Bonnard, Jules Bonnard, Gad Borel, Jean Bourquin, W. Bremi, Arnold Bricod, Frederic Bron, Hans Bruppacher, Charles Brutsch, Joseph Buhlmann, Marc Buck, Robert Cand, Jean-Louis Charpie,

G. Chautems, Prof. Marcel Cristen, Laurent Clerc, Franz Delhove, Gaston Deluz, Th. Dieterle, Charles Dintheer, Claude Dolivo, Reynold Dubois, William A. Dudde, Jacques Du Pasquier, Michel Du Pasquier, Richard Ecklin, Andre Emery, Julien Erni, Paul Fatton, Fernand Favre, Pierre Favre, Marc Flubacher, Charles Freundler, Willy Fritschy, Renaud Gallaz, Max Geiger, David Gigon, Louis Girardet, Roger Giarodon, Theodore Gorge, Prof. William Goy, Marcel Grand, Michel Grenier, Marcel Grobety, Gerard Guenod, Jean Guye, Alfred Gyax, R. Hemmeler, Jacques Henriod, Willi Hirsch, H. Hoegger, Francois Hoguer, Paul-Emile Ingold, Bernard Jeanneret, Pierre Jeanneret, Marcel Jeannet, Paul Jomini, Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Willi Kobe, M. B. Koelbing, H. Kuhner, William Lachat, R. Lanz, Maurice Lauter, Antoinette Lozeron, J. Mangold, K. Marti, M. Martin, Prof. Charles Masson, Henry Mercier, Philippe de Mestral, Prof. Jean Meyhoffer, Henri Nicod, Albert Nicole, Bernard Nicole, Philippe Nicole, Edouard Pache, Daniel Pache, Edouard Panchaud, Sully Perrenoud, Albert Perrenoud, Willy Perriard, M. Petremand, Albert Pfund, Henri Piguet, Henri Pingeon, Paul Primault, Georges Probst, Prof. Dr. A. Rich, Maurice Robert, Andre Rochat, G. Roggwiler, Jacques Roland, Edouard Rossier, Heinz Rothenbuhler, J. de Roulet, Philippe Roulet, Jean Sauter, Claude Schaerer, W. Schatz, Martin Schwarz, Prof. Christophe Senft, W. Senft, P. Sieveking, E. Sigrist, Paul Siron, Gerard Soguel, Dr. J. J. Stamm, Dr. Paul Strassmann, Bernard Terrisse, P. Trub, Paul Vaucher, Max Vernaud, Georges Vittoz, Jean Vivien, Rene Vuilleumier, Jean Wachsmuth, Edouard Waldvogel, P. Walter, Paul Weber, Bertrand Zweifel.

Uruguay: Earl M. Smith.

A NOTE FROM THE SPONSOR

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is the sponsor of the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam, as it was of its predecessor the wholly American Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam. This does not mean that all of the supporters of the various statements and other actions of these committees endorse the entire position of the fellowship; many—perhaps most—of them do not, and their signatures commit them only to the statements they have signed, the one to the left in particular.

Considering the number of individuals involved and the complications of communication, however, it is unavoidable that decisions as to the time and circumstances under which these statements will be made public must be made by the fellowship. There will be those who will question the decision to publish this statement at this time. Their questions will be of two sorts:

1. Is it fair to publish a statement urging the United States to initiate peace moves at a moment when President Johnson has suspended the bombing of North Vietnam and is insisting on his readiness to negotiate peace?

2. Would it not be wiser to delay publication by 2 weeks more in order to have a fuller representation of signers from other countries? (Committees have been formed in a number of other countries, but have not had time to receive and transmit names of hundreds—perhaps thousands—of signers to the statement. It is probable that 2 weeks from now the number of signers listed here would be doubled or trebled.)

We have considered both these matters carefully and make these comments.

The peace offensive

We are gratified at the suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam, though we regret the continuation of bombing in South Vietnam and deplore the initiation of bombing in Laos. We rejoice at the emphasis on peace that has dominated our Government's statements in the past few weeks, and earnestly

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

925

hope that it may continue. Some aspects of that emphasis, as well as the report that there has been no positive response from Hanoi make us uneasy, however.

Both in the President's state of the Union address and in other Government statements, the war in Vietnam continues to be described without qualification as "Communist aggression." From the point of view of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), however, the genesis of the war was the refusal of the South Vietnamese Government under President Diem, supported by the United States, to permit the 1956 elections that had been the keystone of the armistice signed in Geneva in 1954. That armistice, ending the war between the victorious Viet Minh and the defeated French, had provided for the withdrawal of the Viet Minh north of the 17th parallel and the French south of it, as a temporary measure until the French could withdraw completely and nationwide elections under international supervision in July 1956, would unite the country. Millions of non-Communists throughout the world, whatever their ultimate political sympathies, agree that the refusal to permit these elections was the violation of the armistice that laid the foundation for the conflict now going on.

In the second place, though the President on January 12 carried the matter of Vietcong representation in negotiations an inch further in saying that "we will consider the views of any group," he has not accepted what many qualified observers consider may be the *sine qua non* for negotiations; recognition of the Vietcong National Liberation Front as a full principal in such negotiations. Since NLF has been the principal opposition force throughout the last 10 years of war, and since it now actually governs substantial portions of South Vietnam, it is not hard to understand its insistence that it be a direct and full participant in the negotiations.

Why now?

January 23 is the final day of the lunar new year celebration known in Vietnam as Tet, and the final day of the truce agreed upon by both sides. The days that follow may well be decisive in determining whether this brutal, bloody war will be ended or escalated. Hence this is a critical moment for those whose compassion goes out to the helpless Vietnamese people caught in this storm of ideological destruction and murder, and who are concerned lest all humanity's future be engulfed in nuclear conflict.

This is the moment to bring maximum, insistent pressure on both sides to make peace, to moderate their rigidities. It is a moment to insist that the United States recognize and deal with motivations on the other side that are more than simple aggression. It is also a moment to insist that the Government of North Vietnam and the leaders of the National Liberation Front respond to the American peace proposals more positively than with vituperation and mockery, stating in unequivocal language what specifically they consider to be wrong and how it could be set right.

These are the considerations that led to the decision to publish the statement now, while the U.S. Government still seeks peace and, regrettably, even before the names of many signers from this country and abroad can be included.

We hope that those who read this statement will feel led also to bring maximum pressure to bear on both sides, with letters to all the parties involved. Letters to governments can be addressed to Washington, Hanoi, and Saigon, of course; letters to the Vietcong forces may be addressed to Front National de Liberation du Sud-Vietnam, 18 Longevin, El Mouradia, Algiers, Algeria.

ALFRED HASSLER,
Executive Secretary,
Fellowship of Reconciliation.

THE MANSFIELD REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, during the recess between the 1st and the 2d sessions of the 89th Congress, our able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], accompanied by four of our eminent colleagues, Senators MUSKIE, INOYE, AIKEN, and Boggs, at the request of the President, undertook a study mission to Europe and Asia.

As a result of this 30-day mission, the study group filed with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 3, 1966, a detailed, realistic report on the United States involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam entitled: "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow."

I ask unanimous consent that that report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the letter of transmittal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, at the present time, it is obvious that the administration has under serious consideration the determination as to whether or not there should be further escalation of our military commitment in Vietnam. It would be well if those charged with such decision read carefully and fully the report submitted by Senator MANSFIELD and his colleagues.

Senator MANSFIELD is well qualified to head such a mission. A student of Asia, its history and politics, he submitted, February 25, 1963, and at various earlier times, reports on Vietnam and southeast Asia containing predictions of things to come there unless our policies were altered. His sage advice then remained unheeded. I hope his warning contained in this report will be more carefully considered.

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was also a valuable addition to the study team, serving as he does as minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations with many years of experience in foreign affairs.

In fact, all the members of the study team are to be highly commended for the contribution which they have made to a more realistic appraisal of our Vietnamese involvement.

Some of the more important, sobering conclusions of the report are:

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

"Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation, but also because, with few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the

January 24, 1966

majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future * * *

EXHIBIT 1

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. SENATE,

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,

Washington, D.C., January 3, 1966.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accord with a letter from the President dated November 7, 1965, Senators AIKEN, MUSKIE, BOGGS, and INOUYE joined me in a study mission to Europe and to Asia. The group was drawn in part from the Senate at large, rather than exclusively from the committee, because it seemed to me that it would be useful to add to a joint effort of this kind, the views of Members who could bring other perspectives to the study. In this connection, the contributions of Senators MUSKIE, BOGGS, and INOUYE were exceptional. Insofar as Senator AIKEN is concerned, he also provided not only a bipartisan strength to our purposes, but his great wisdom and judgment and his knowledge based on a long Senate and committee experience.

The mission took us to France, Poland, the Soviet Union, Rumania, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Japan. Consideration was given to the inclusion of both Pakistan and India in the itinerary. It was decided that it would be inadvisable to include these two great countries, because the immediate difficulties with which they are beset over Kashmir are currently under active consideration before the United Nations, and it is the policy of the United States to support fully the efforts of that international body to alleviate these difficulties. In the circumstances and in view of the nature of the group, we did not wish by our presence even to imply otherwise. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, therefore, we proceeded by a longer route from Bucharest to Aden and across the Indian Ocean to Ceylon, making courtesy calls en route in Riyadh and Taiz.

On this mission, which took us more than 30,000 miles in over 30 days, we met with many of our own officials abroad and with officials of other governments. We went not to propound but to ask, to listen, and to note. To the extent that we spoke, it was to stress the essential unity of the Nation, irrespective of party or personal view in matters which affect the Nation in its relations with other nations. We emphasized the deep concern of the President and the people for peace, and the profound preference which this Nation has for the works of construction over those of destruction. We reiterated the deep and firm commitment of the United States to a just resolution of the conflict in Vietnam.

We were at all times correctly and courteously received and, on occasion, with very great warmth. Conversations with the officials of other governments were invariably frank, often animated, but never personally discourteous even where our points of view

differed most markedly. Almost without exception, officials put their cards on the table. We did the same.

Reports covering the situation in Vietnam and on other aspects of the mission were submitted to the President on December 19, 1965, the day following my return to Washington. Subsequently, these were discussed when I met with Secretaries Rusk and McNamara. A report reflecting the joint observations and conclusions of the group as the situation appeared to us in November-December 1965 is now submitted herewith to you as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The situation in Vietnam and its worldwide ramifications constitute the gravest international problem which has confronted the United States in many years. In connection therewith, the forces of the United States in Vietnam (under Gen. William C. Westmoreland) are performing a profound service at great personal sacrifice on behalf of the Nation. It is essential that the full dimensions of the Vietnamese problem be explored and considered as thoroughly and as widely as practicable in present circumstances. It was in the hope that a constructive contribution will be made to this exploration and discussion, that this report was prepared for the use of the committee and the Senate. There has also been included, as an appendix to this report, a study made public by a similar Senate group in a previous presidential mission 3 years ago. It may help to provide a useful perspective for the current situation in Vietnam.

I should like to note before closing a matter of special interest to the committee. The Ambassadors and the officers of the Department of State abroad were immensely helpful to the mission. Administrative arrangements for the group were exceptionally effective and efficient. The knowledge, understanding, and diplomatic skills of the embassy staffs which were placed at our disposal were generally outstanding in character. And the cooperation of the Defense Department, not only in providing efficient transportation but in many other ways, was of the greatest value to us.

The group had as escort from the Department of State, Minister Francis E. Meloy, Jr., Mr. W. O. Trone, Director of the Office of Operations, Department of State, and Mr. Paul Kelly. The Department of Defense provided the services of Maj. Gen. Charles R. Roderick, Col. Frank Goss, and Lt. Col. George L. J. Dalferes. The assistance of these men was highly effective in every respect and of the greatest value to the group.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANFIELD.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong

sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon Government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 provinces. Each province chief, who has a military as well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. U.S. and international forces in Vietnam

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about 21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea, an infantry battalion, and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division, and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

927

fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B-52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hao and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Ranh Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command emphasizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these forces have suffered during the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (Peoples' Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltration from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500

per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. Current state of the war

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds of anti-aircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants. In the month of November 1965, alone, 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. The security situation in South Vietnam

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Pleiku, a major military strong point in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. Vietcong reactions

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of the U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in

sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the Armed Forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.¹ Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of Government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of the war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky

The new leadership in Government, which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representative civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under Government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

¹ The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

11. The pacification or civic action program

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the Government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the Government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life. This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands. Sugar also comes to Sai-

gon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither and fail.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966 will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and that about 18 percent inhabit contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present, under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit and run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

B. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungle foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Srae) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

929

Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the south-east Asian mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakhek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonaligned Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever

it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and vehement against U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other Cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) the war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Com-

munist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon Government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a

most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standoff, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many imponderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER WRITES ABOUT LEWIS AND CLARK

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, one of America's most imaginative and active minds belongs to the eminent naval officer, Adm. H. G. Rickover. He possesses many talents. He has a wide range of interests. No matter on what subject he writes or talks, he is always able to interpret the information in a colorful and interesting way.

During the congressional recess, I received a letter from Admiral Rickover, written in the North Atlantic, aboard the U.S.S. *Lewis and Clark*, our new nuclear submarine. This is our 33d nuclear submarine. Admiral Rickover reported, and, added to the fleet of 22 other attack-type submarines, brings our total attack fleet to 55.

However, the very interesting part of the admiral's letter was a review of the

accomplishments of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the famous explorers who traveled through the area which now comprises my home State, as well as all the States adjacent to the Missouri River. Admiral Rickover gives a condensed review of the travels of Lewis and Clark in a most vivid manner. Because I feel that not enough is known about these famous explorers, or what they hoped to do and what they actually did do, I asked Admiral Rickover for permission—which I have received—to place his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where I am sure it will be read by many persons heretofore unfamiliar with a great part of our American history and heritage.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT SEA, U.S.S. "LEWIS AND CLARK"

(SSBN-644).

North Atlantic, November 16, 1965.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Lewis and Clark*, our 33d Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 55. The *Lewis and Clark* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.

This ship is named for Meriwether Lewis (1774-1809) and William Clark (1770-1883), the Virginia-born captains under whose joint command a small American Army unit (3 sergeants, 24 men, 1 Indian, and 2 French Canadian interpreters) crossed from St. Louis to the mouth of the Columbia River and back, thus competing one of the great transcontinental voyages of exploration, ranking in importance with those of Balboa (1513) and Mackenzie (1793).

Planned and personally supervised by President Jefferson, the expedition had as its objective exploration of "the Missouri River, and such principal streams of it, as by its course and communication with the waters of the Pacific Ocean * * * may offer the most direct and practicable water communication across this continent." If such a water route could be found, much of the lucrative fur trade, then largely in Canadian hands, might be diverted to American seaports. The President had long been interested in exploring this possibility; had, in fact, given aid to three previous attempts that came to nothing. He obtained from the Congress authorization and an initial grant of \$2,500 in January 1803, a few months before the uncharted territory to be traversed by Lewis and Clark passed into our possession through the Louisiana Purchase. The expedition got underway, May 1804, in a bateau and two pirogues and did not return until nearly 2½ years later.

It is difficult for us to realize the importance of water transportation in those days. Men were inclined to believe certain navigable routes must exist simply because they so ardently wished that they should exist. Thus, the hope of reaching the Orient by sailing westward was not relinquished even after it became known that the American land mass stood as a barrier between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; this hope was merely transferred northward to the inland waterways of North America, where for 300 years Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Englishmen diligently searched for the mythical Northwest Passage first postulated by Verrazano in 1524. To discover this passage was one of the avowed objects of the Hudson Bay Co.

Some envisaged it as a strait across Canada at the latitude of Hudson Bay, others as a comingling of the headwaters of major eastward and westward flowing rivers. Both versions of the myth were inscribed, as late as 1767, in Jonathan Carver's map of America. Explorers kept the myth alive by asserting as fact what was pure fantasy. Thus, in 1765, Robert Rogers stated categorically that between the sources of the Missouri and the great river of the west the portage was not above 30 miles. His river of the west was pure figment of the imagination but, oddly enough, speculation placed it near the actual location of the Columbia. No one then knew of the Rocky Mountains or imagined that such a barrier might divide America's eastern and western rivers.

It must be counted a major gain of the Lewis and Clark expedition that it laid to rest forever the myth of a navigable passage across the continent. It established, by actual observation, that the sources of the Missouri and Columbia lay too far apart for an easy portage and that neither river was truly navigable in its upper reaches. A feasible route from St. Louis to the Pacific was, indeed, mapped out, but 430 miles of it ran overland through rugged terrain, and the 3,555 miles by river were part way navigable by canoe only. Not until a century later did Amundsen find the only true Northwest Passage which does not, of course, bisect the continent but runs along Baffin Island through the Arctic Ocean. In 1960, the nuclear submarine *Seadragon* traversed the passage underwater.

If then the Lewis and Clark expedition could find no natural and easy cross-continental water route, it accomplished what in the end proved more important: It greatly strengthened our claim to the Oregon Territory, originally based on the discovery of the Columbia River in 1792 by Capt. Robert Gray of the American ship *Columbia Rediviva*. Over the route mapped by Lewis and Clark soon came American trappers, and in 1811 Fort Astoria was built at the mouth of the Columbia, the first permanent settlement in the Oregon country.

America won the race to the Pacific by a hair's breadth, for Canadian traders were fast approaching the coast. Mackenzie had traversed Canada from Lake Athabaska to the mouth of the Bella Coola as early as 1793. Simon Fraser came down the river named for him in 1808, and David Thompson followed part of the Lewis and Clark route in 1811. When he reached the mouth of the Columbia, he saw the American flag flying over Fort Astoria—it had been raised but a few months earlier. As the historian John Bakeless writes: "Because of the Corps of Discovery, Oregon is American today. And 10 white stars in the blue field of Old Glory stand for States of the Union that one by one grew up in the farms and mills, cities and homesteads, along the trail where weary men in tattered elk-skin cursed the rocks that tore their feet, sweated at the tow rope, poled against the savage current of the muddy Missouri, stumbled in the chilly streams of the Rockies, and staggered down the western end of the Lolo Trail." It had been a hard journey and a long one. When Clark wrote in his diary, November 7, 1805, "Ocean in view. Oh joy!" the weary explorers doubtless felt much the same triumph and relief as the men on the three small Spanish caravels when they heard the lookout on the *Pinta* cry "Tierra! Tierra!"

Charting a course—4,000 miles each way—through unknown territory inhabited by numerous, often hostile Indians, surely was difficult enough, but many other tasks were imposed on Lewis and Clark by Jefferson. He instructed them to keep a daily record of the weather and an accurate description of the route traversed; to ascertain "by celestial observation, the geography of the country"; describe in detail its fauna, flora,

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

907

portance and I believe it deserves an explanation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services this morning that this was a bill which had to be considered in relation to the loaning of one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China.

The purpose, according to the report would be to authorize that loan, and, quoting from the report:

The loan of these vessels is intended to give the Republic of China an increased capability to defend her contiguous waters against aggressive acts and to augment the free world naval forces in the western Pacific.

Is that enough information for the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. It is an explanation; and I believe it is good that it has been made. As I understand, this is a loan of a destroyer and a destroyer escort to the Republic of China?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. A full report will be incorporated in the Record.

CONSERVATION—AND DESERVED RECOGNITION TO SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, conservation is everyone's business. Unfortunately, too few Americans make it their business. As a result, the task of preserving our natural resources—of developing them but not exploiting them—has fallen on a few dedicated persons in both public and private life.

We in the West, enriched as we are with an abundance of magnificent natural wealth and beauty, are probably more aware of the need for balanced development of our natural resources than any other section of the country.

I am proud of the fact that our western congressional delegations have initiated and supported most of the great conservation measures that exist today. Last week, I was privileged to vote in support of another of the great pieces of legislation aimed at preserving for future generations, portions of America's rich heritage of splendor.

In voting for Senate passage of the national wild rivers system bill, I also acknowledged the outstanding leadership that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has played in so many conservation efforts.

Conservation means far more than simple preservation. Wise use and management of our resources rank equally with wise preservation and management and in both fields. FRANK CHURCH has been the one who has shown the way and lighted our legislative steps. A half dozen great dams and reclamation projects bear the imprint of his effort, along with many other smaller projects. He has battled for continued and increased soil conservation measures and has pleaded for additional funds to open up our great western forests for larger timber outputs and for greater recreational uses.

As sponsor of the Wilderness Act, the Nez Perce National Historic Park bill, and the wild rivers bill, and as floor manager for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, he has assured our grandchildren and our great grandchildren that segments of the American natural heritage will be theirs to enjoy, even as it has been ours.

It is fitting, Madam President, that we should recognize the effort and dedication of our distinguished colleague from the State of Idaho. It is even more satisfying to know that others appreciate his work and look to him as a champion of the cause of conservation. It is to the latter events that I direct the interest of the Senate.

On December 20, 1965, the Senator from Idaho was named the Idaho Conservationist of the Year by the Idaho Wildlife Federation. In appropriate ceremonies in Boise, Idaho, the Governor of Idaho, the Honorable Robert E. Smylie presented the Senator with the annual Governor's Award. Governor Smylie noted at that time a fact that we in the Senate have long known, that conservation is truly a bipartisan matter.

As the result of that award, the Senator from Idaho then became a finalist in the National Wildlife Federation annual competition for outstanding conservation honors.

On January 11, 1966, at the annual banquet of the National Wildlife Federation at the Hotel Statler Hilton, here in Washington, D.C., the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] received the National Conservation Legislative Award from the hands of the First Lady of our country. This came only moments after Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson had herself, received the Federation's National Distinguished Service Award. The citation to the Senator from Idaho with the award read as follows:

For significant congressional leadership in the creation of the national wilderness preservation system and for exceptional statesmanship and skill in focusing public attention on the need for preserving wild rivers, parks, and outdoor recreation areas.

Madam President, the senior Senator from Idaho has brought great honor to himself. But in so doing, he has reflected credit upon every Member of this body. We who have served with him during the years that the wilderness bill was debated, the Nez Perce National Historical Park was created, the wild rivers bill passed by the Senate and a host of other measures, have been termed "Conservation Congressmen" by our fellow Americans. If we are truly worthy of this honor, Madam President, it is because our able colleague, Mr. CHURCH, has guided our thoughts and actions.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUB- STANCE AND THE SHADOW

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, last fall it was my privilege to be a member of what has since been described in the press as the Mansfield mission.

Under the distinguished leadership of Senator MANSFIELD, it was our objective, in his words, "to look, to listen, to ask

questions, and to report" to the President and the Senate.

In this factfinding process we engaged in some 50 formal discussions with the leaders of the countries we visited and with our representatives in those countries.

For us, as Senators, it was an invaluable opportunity to observe conditions in those countries, to hear firsthand the reaction of their leaders to our policies, to state and clarify U.S. positions, and to get in-depth briefings from American representatives in the field.

Our approach to our mission was simple: First, to discuss any subject, any problem, any issue, any point of friction raised by our hosts; second, to state and to clarify, to the best of our ability, any American policy involved; third, to consider, evaluate, and report to the President any suggestion, express or implied, to deal more effectively with any problem; and fourth, to note any possibility, however vague or remote, for moving toward a reduction of friction.

This approach led to discussions of a wide range of subjects in almost every country. The list included few, if any, surprises. The one subject which arose in every instance was Vietnam.

I take this opportunity to pay a personal tribute to the effective and able leadership of Senator MANSFIELD in developing the maximum utility of this kind of mission. His dignified and courteous, but "no nonsense" approach to our discussions was received with respect and frankness from our hosts, without exception. In my judgment, he made a major contribution to better understanding, in places where such understanding is important, of our country's purposes, intentions, and motivations.

The wise and distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, performed an invaluable service as "co-leader" of the mission. He was a never-failing source of good counsel and sound judgment.

The intelligent, hard working, and dedicated work of my good friends, Senator CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, and Senator DANIEL INOUYE, of Hawaii, completed the team of which I was proud to be a member.

The report of our mission has received wide attention and comment. Many descriptive labels have been attached to it. It was our purpose to produce a report which was, above all else, "realistic." It is the hope, I am sure, of each of us that the report may contribute to a sound understanding of the realities upon which to base the serious decisions we face.

Because there is such widespread interest in the report, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of

large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon Government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 Provinces. Each Province chief, who has a military as well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. U.S. and international forces in Vietnam

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about

21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea an infantry battalion and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B-52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hoa and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Ranh Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command emphasizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these

forces have suffered during the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (People's Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltrated from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500 per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. Current state of the war

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds and antiaircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants. In the month of November 1965, alone, 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition, 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. The security situation in South Vietnam

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Pleiku, a major military strongpoint in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. Vietcong reactions

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

909

Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the armed forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.¹ Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky

The new leadership in government which is drawn largely from military circles is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representa-

tive civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

11. The pacification or civic action program

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life.

This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and Provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands. Sugar also comes to Saigon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither and fail.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966, will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and about 18 percent inhabits contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present,

¹ The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit-and-run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon Government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

II. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungle foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to

the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serei) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the southeast Asia mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakkek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonaligned Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence

the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and vehement against U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the East-

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

911

ern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) the war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Communist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a

reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standstill, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many impoundables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, since our return from our travels, each

of us, of course, has been asked to add our personal impressions to the report.

The report speaks for itself and represents a consensus of the five Senators involved. Nevertheless, it cannot conceivably encompass the hundreds of reactions and impressions which we experienced and are still digesting.

It may be useful, therefore, Madam President, to include at this point in the Record—and I ask unanimous consent to do so—some excerpts from comments I have made since our return.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I have said that Vietnam was the single, consistently recurring subject in our discussions:

Only the Communist countries urged our unconditional withdrawal from South Vietnam—with varying degrees of emphasis and harshness in their criticism of American policy.

There appeared to be an underlying regret in Warsaw, Moscow, and Bucharest that the Vietnam problem exists and a wish that it might go away—but the words used consistently placed responsibility upon the United States for the existence of the problem and for eliminating it.

There was a general uneasiness about the dreadful uncertainties to which the Vietnamese conflict might lead.

There was a general pessimism about the prospects for a negotiated settlement, but indications of an interest in contributing to that objective if the opportunity arose.

Support for U.S. policy in Vietnam varied inversely with the distance from southeast Asia.

There was very great uneasiness in southeast Asia as to the consequences for southeast Asian countries of a complete U.S. withdrawal.

All the areas of the world which we visited were a constant source of interest to all of us, but southeast Asia had a particular fascination.

It is, of course, the site of our greatest overseas problem.

It is an area of great variety and beauty.

It is an area of great resources and potential richness.

On the surface, the five countries we visited—Burma, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and South Vietnam—have much in common and would appear to have much to gain from a closer association.

In reality there are differences and divisions, deep seated and historic, which are sources of constant friction—and instability even within a given country.

And the gap between the rich and the poor is as great as anywhere in the world, and productive of more instability.

There is no love or natural affinity between any of these countries and China—before or since mainland China has gone Communist; and each of these countries, in its own way is seeking to be independent of Chinese domination and control.

There is no question in my mind but that all of them would fall under Chinese domination and control if the United States withdraws or is driven from South Vietnam.

To the leaders of Red China, South Vietnam is just another incident in the long struggle which they have waged for 40 years and which they intend to continue to wage for the ultimate supremacy of their brand of communism in the world.

They will not be diverted from their ultimate objective by whatever happens in Vietnam.

Only the forces of evolution and change, when, as, and if their country emerges as a modern, industrial state, can blunt or eliminate their revolutionary fervor and per-

January 24, 1966

suade them to accept coexistence and diversity as the normal condition of the world. This is the reality as we seek a way to resolve the Vietnam dilemma.

SUBSTITUTION OF PRIVATE FOR PUBLIC CREDIT

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, I am sure that Senators on both sides of the aisle will welcome the special emphasis that President Johnson's budget places on urging the private financial community to participate more fully in financing major Federal credit programs.

In the coming fiscal year, the Federal Government plans to relinquish to private buyers \$4.7 billion of Federal loans—including both individual loans and opportunities to participate in pools of loans.

To make this possible, the President proposes to broaden the whole range of assets now sold through participation pools. He also proposes to expand the newly enacted program under which State and nonprofit agencies, with Federal assistance, insure private loans to college students, so as to reduce the budgetary requirements for direct Federal loans.

The President's program of substituting private for public credit—wherever consistent with program objectives—is in line with policies voiced by each of the last three Presidents. It fulfills the recommendations made in 1963 by the Committee on Federal Credit Programs that "Government credit programs should, in principle, supplement or stimulate private lending, rather than substitute for it"—a report endorsed by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

It carries out the views so cogently expressed by the minority members of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1963 when they declared that "The administration can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets."

Finally, this emphasis is most timely in the light of the special urgency of total budget requirements this year. By substituting private for public credit, we can free money for high-priority programs without increasing budget expenditures.

This is realistic, sensible, financial management.

It penalizes no beneficiary of public credit assistance.

It encourages the private credit system to share with Government the responsibility and opportunity to build the Great Society.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA TO GEORGIA STATE LEGISLATURE, JANUARY 17, 1966

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] recently delivered an outstanding address to the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, meeting at the State Capitol in Atlanta.

Appearing before a joint session of the State senate and the Georgia House of

Representatives, Senator RUSSELL outlined in some detail the lasting and meaningful results of more than 3 decades of service in the U.S. Senate to his native State and to his Nation. As his record clearly shows, his primary concern has always been and will always be the well-being of the people of his State, as well as the security and best interests of the United States. The warmth and respect with which Senator RUSSELL is regarded by an overwhelming majority of the people of Georgia was demonstrated by the enthusiastic reception he received from members of the Georgia Legislature, prior to, during, and following his address.

Just as the senior Senator from Georgia is held in high esteem by his fellow Georgians, so is he in the Chamber of the U.S. Senate. I know of no other Member of this body who is more respected for his unswerving allegiance to the principles which have made this Nation what it is today, for his steadfastness in holding to heartfelt convictions, or for his knowledge of the parliamentary inner workings and procedures of this body than my beloved senior colleague and warm friend, DICK RUSSELL.

Madam President, I commend Senator RUSSELL's remarks to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL
PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA AT THE CAPITOL, ATLANTA, MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1966

It is a high honor to stand again in this historic hall where men and events have met to shape the destiny of our beloved Georgia.

For me, each return visit to this general assembly is a sentimental and deeply moving experience. It brings back a flood of nostalgic memories of my own service in this body. I count the 10 years I spent as a member of the house from Barrow County—4 of them as speaker—as among the most pleasant and satisfying of my career.

This occasion today is especially meaningful. Last year, for the only time in my life, I was unable to respond to a call to address this assembly. I can assure you that my esteem and respect for this body and its members are such that only illness prevented my presence on that occasion.

HEALTHY GOOD, SPIRITS HIGH

So this morning I welcome the opportunity to redeem myself. I am happy to say that today my health is good, my spirits are high, and my face is turned full to the future. I look forward to serving Georgia in the Senate of the United States for many years to come—provided that meets with approval of the people of this State.

In both basis of organization and membership, this general assembly is different from any that has met here in the memory of man. But I am confident that its dedication and devotion to the welfare of Georgia is as great as any that has gone before. I am sure that you will discharge every responsibility without fear, favor, or intimidation.

Georgia, in common with the rest of the country, is undergoing a period of whirlwind change and transition. When I was a member of this house, two-thirds of the people of Georgia lived on farms and in rural areas. Today, however, slightly more than half of our people reside in urban com-

munities—and the trend to the city is almost certain to continue in the coming years.

These changes have brought about a host of new and perplexing problems that are peculiar alike to the rural and the urban areas of our State.

In searching for solutions to our problems, I know there will be differences and conflicts among you. But these can be resolved if they are approached in a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding—and in accordance with the words inscribed on our great seal—in "wisdom, justice, and moderation."

GEORGIA'S HORIZON UNLIMITED

Nothing can do more to enhance the future of Georgia than to have all our people from all sections working in harmony together for the common good of all. We must not jeopardize that future through a needless struggle between urban and rural interests that can only bring harm to the people of both sections.

Georgia today is forging forward in all areas of life and in all spheres of activity. In the dark and discouraging years that followed Appomattox, the eloquent and incandescent Benjamin Harvey Hill uttered some words that Georgians of his day and ours have taken to heart. He said: "We can live neither in nor by the defeated past, and if we would live in the growing, conquering future, we must furnish our strength to shape its course, and our will to discharge its duties."

This we have done. Upon a proud and honorable heritage, we are constructing a new and modern Georgia that blends the best of the old with the promise of the new.

Today, the future beckons as never before with hope and opportunity for all our people. A recent survey by the U.S. Department of Commerce revealed that in 34 of 35 categories Georgia has outstripped the Nation in industrial growth since 1948. In the same period, the average income of Georgians has doubled—though in our self-congratulation on this achievement let us not forget that we are still behind many other States. This is an area in which we must do better.

WORKING FOR GEORGIA

During my years in the Senate, I have worked with unstinting zeal and energy to advance Georgia's progress in every legitimate and proper way at my command. I have undertaken to see that Georgia receives full opportunity to participate in all Federal programs and activities which our people, after all, help to pay for with their tax dollars. I have done so in the conviction that I have been elected to represent and work for Georgia's interest in Washington—and not Washington's interest in Georgia.

The record, I think, bears evidence that these efforts have borne fruit. Let me quickly summarize some major areas:

National defense

Some 60,000 Georgians today are employed on the 15 major military bases located in Georgia and in defense-related industrial activities. The total impact on the Georgia economy of military and defense payrolls and activities amounts to well over \$1 billion annually and is increasing. Last year, for the first time, Georgia became one of the 10 leading States in dollar volume of defense contracts—and this was before selection of the Lockheed Co. at Marietta to build the mammoth C-5A aircraft—one of the largest defense contracts ever to be awarded.

River development

Four of Georgia's principal rivers—the Savannah, the Chattahoochee, the Coosa, and the Flint—are under major development by the Corps of Engineers and construction of four new multipurpose dams is underway or is authorized. In the postwar period, we have opened 500 miles of year-round navigable waterways on our rivers and our goal is to add another 250 miles in the foresee-

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

881

the unhoused to have homes. He learned there that they could not protect such policies when the interest rates were being increased in this bludgeon-like manner. If the interest rate did not go up on the loan, the discount would come in on the mortgage and the homeowner would be hurt in either instance because the piper must be paid.

Once the decision to increase the interest rates had been determined by the Federal Reserve Board, the cost of the housing had to march ahead in order to take care of this interest payment. This meant that if a person were buying a \$20,000 home and the interest rate goes up one-half percent, which it immediately did, there was a \$100 cost which had to be absorbed on a discount, or spread across the life of the mortgage. It meant monthly payments had to be increased by \$6 a month. To qualify for the home the man had to have a pay increase of \$24 a month. Now, for goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, if what we are trying to do here is to stop inflation, then I suggest to you the action of the Fed brought about the very condition that they were predicting because in the little movement recited above you can see the house cost increase and the payment per month has to increase. Therefore the wages, in order to take care of these demands, have to be increased. So, if we are upping the demand for wages and if we are upping the consumer prices, we are certainly moving forward on what I should judge is the common man's interpretation of inflation.

Therefore, it seems to me it was a very unhappy thing to do this. I must join the gentleman from Wisconsin in that determination, in that the Federal Reserve chose to make the determination they did at the time that they did it. It seems to me that the record is not yet clear as to how they can justify this move. I predict to you that the record will not show now or in the immediate future that the move they have made has stopped in any way the seeking of loans for investment. The bank loans have increased since the movement of the Fed. Everybody has rushed into the market because they said that inflation is coming. Immediately they charged the money market up, and there has been a greater demand as a result. I have seen no effect in the area in which one would hope to have gotten an effect. That leads me to believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin is right. Instead of firing a cannon they should have called up the riflemen and should have zeroed in on the problems on a selective basis. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I would hope that we can look in the future to action by the Federal Reserve Board that will really indicate they are a part of this Government and intend to be as responsible and as responsive as the rest of us in Government have to be.

I shall look forward to that great day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], who is one of the most industrious and scholarly of our colleagues and

who, particularly as a member of the great House Committee on Banking and Currency takes seriously the obligation which that membership entails for him, that he keep a continuing surveillance over monetary conditions in this country.

I am proud and delighted that the gentleman shares my hope that the annual report of the Federal Reserve, which will be delivered to our committee in a matter of weeks, will contain a reasoned account of what the Fed has done and an effort to come to grips with some of the problems and possibilities which I have discussed here this afternoon.

I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, committees of the Congress are presently considering various aspects of our Nation's very substantial effort to stem Communist military and psychological aggressions in southeast Asia. Very shortly the Congress will act on the President's request for supplemental funds in the fiscal year 1966 budget to support our military operations in Vietnam. We will be asked to approve some additions to nonmilitary spending, specifically to permit expansion of the U.S. AID programs in South Vietnam.

I am confident the Congress will act speedily on the President's request, thus reaffirming its strong support for the President's policies and actions.

The situation confronting the United States in southeast Asia is difficult, complex, and fraught with danger. If it were anything less, it would not be the issue to which this Congress will devote the far greater share of its attention in the months that lie ahead. The actions of the Congress will, in large measure, determine the course the country shall follow; our decisions will influence the military and political actions of the United States.

I expect the Congress will engage in a broad and sweeping review of the situation. It is right that we should do so. I am confident the most searching studies will confirm that the President has followed a course of action best suited to achieve our objectives which are to preserve the integrity of the established Government of the Republic of Vietnam, to turn back the armed aggressors from the North and to bring about a cessation of hostilities and a just and enduring peace.

The grave responsibility for the military and political actions necessary to achieve these objectives rests with the President. He, in his loneliness, wisdom, and conscience, must make the decisions. This is the shattering burden of the man in the White House.

Wide interest at the present moment is focused on the pause in the bombing. Great pressure is being brought to bear to resume the bombing. It may well be that a resumption will of necessity come about.

The decision on how long to continue

the suspension of bombing against the north is one which only those with knowledge of all the developments, both military and diplomatic, can reach a meaningful judgment. Few are in possession of such knowledge. The President is. I will say, however, that once the bombing is resumed, the momentum established as the result of the present pause and the intent diplomatic activity which has accompanied it will die and the openings toward peace which might have developed will close.

We can resume the bombing of the north at any time, in a matter of minutes, and the advantages of that course—both physical and psychological—will immediately come into play. But the present efforts dedicated to seeking out a peaceful, political settlement—which the President has told us have thus far achieved neither success or failure—would then be shut off, in a sense wasted. If we continue this peace effort a while longer, we do not sacrifice our ability to reinstitute the bombing whenever we might. But if we send the bombers against the north prematurely we have sacrificed—at this stage, in this time—the chances for moving in the direction of resolving the conflict in a peaceful manner. Therefore, unless there is an immediate and overriding necessity to resume the bombing of North Vietnam, I am inclined to believe that we should not press the President to do so now. If the bombs fall so will fall the hopes for an early settlement. We will know then that the aggressors can only be deterred through continued military pressure.

The President is dedicated to peace but he is also dedicated to protecting the lives of the young Americans involved in the war. Both these goals are equated with the present bombing pause. I am sure that the President will make the right decision when all the ingredients have been evaluated. To press him now to resume bombing is but adding one more strain to what must be an agonizing review of the limited options at his disposal.

I address myself to a fundamental and therefore critical point—whether, as has been suggested in some circles the United States should make a formal declaration of war against North Vietnam.

This, in my opinion, would be a most unwise move. I know that many Members share my concern that we should even seriously consider such an action. The President now has the emergency powers and authority necessary to act. The Congress in joint resolution dated August 10, 1964, approved all steps taken including the use of armed force, in the defense and freedom in southeast Asia.

Let us be mindful that although we are involved in sizable military operations in support of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, we are at the same time, engaged in continuing worldwide effort to bring an end to conflict, to move from the jungle battlefields to the conference table. We seek to curtail the conflict, not broaden it. We seek to end it, not extend it.

The President of the United States must have flexibility to act quickly and decisively in a situation of this type.

A declaration of war would deny him this flexibility. It would place him in a rigid position, very severely reducing his capability of quick action to take advantage of either military or political targets of opportunity.

We must be conscious of the political sensitivity of our involvement in southeast Asia. Great change has taken place in the past two decades in the relationships between nations.

Although we are the most powerful nation on earth, we must be mindful that we live in a community of nations, many of whom are alined with us in the fight to halt the spread of communism. I am certain that a declaration of war would prove distressing to most of the allied nations who support our present policies and actions in Vietnam.

As war has become more devastating, diplomacy has become infinitely more delicate, more urgent. As the likelihood of expansion of a conflict increases, a responsible nation must intensify its efforts to end conflict.

The United States possesses military power so tremendous that it is almost beyond the comprehension of man. A declaration of war would assume the full application of that power with rather limited restraints in the hands of the President. At a time when our objective is to limit the conflict in southeast Asia and to end it as quickly as possible, a declaration of war would tend to broaden it, quite possibly extend it.

One who possesses great power must have the will and the means to control power. In the context of our involvement in Vietnam, there must be day-to-day, hour-to-hour management of our military operations at the highest level. The President, committed in an open campaign for peace, must have the control that can immediately escalate or de-escalate our military effort as may be in his sound judgment and dictated by developments.

If a declaration of war assumes the application of maximum military power, as most nations would take it to mean, it assumes destruction of North Vietnam. This, we are attempting to convince the world, is not an objective of the United States.

Our objective is to apply the military power necessary to rid the Republic of Vietnam of the armed aggressors—and to permit, in time free and open elections, a self-determination by the citizens of that country. What damage has been done and what further damage may be wrought by American firepower in North Vietnam is what is necessary to curtail and eventually to halt Hanoi's support of the Vietcong. This, we hope, is clearly understood by the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Although our objectives may be limited, our determination to achieve those objectives is not. It becomes more firm. The President, as he has so often stated, will apply the power necessary to halt the aggression. We will meet our commitments in southeast Asia.

I cannot give too great an emphasis to the point that a declaration of war would have serious international implications. This is so not only because as

I have noted, a declaration would assume dedication to the total destruction of the enemy, but it would question the validity of the President's statements concerning his desire for a peaceful settlement. Our hope, of course, is that, in time, Hanoi will take a more reasoned and rational approach to a solution. A declaration of war would reduce such a possibility.

In this age, as post-World War II history shows, it is important that a powerful nation tailor its actions, both political and military, to existing situations. In Greece, threatened by Communist guerrillas in 1947, President Truman assumed a firm position in support of the Greek Government, providing necessary support to sustain that government. He designed his strategy and his policies to fit the existing situation.

The situation in Korea called for a totally different strategy, a tremendously expanded effort, approaching but not quite becoming a total effort. Here again, President Truman had the flexibility a Chief Executive needs.

The most recent example of controlled response was President Kennedy's handling of the Cuban missile crisis. He was prepared to use maximum power, but applied just enough pressure to force withdrawal by the Soviet Union, thus achieving his objective.

President Johnson's decision to halt bombing of North Vietnam properly complimented his very open and determined worldwide effort to bring those in conflict to the conference table. If he had been in an inflexible position, such as we might expect in a state of declared war, an adjustment to compliment a stepped up move toward peace might not have been possible.

The decision as to how long the cessation of bombing shall continue must rest with the President. Only he has knowledge of all of the developments, military and political, that influence the actions that must be taken to achieve our objectives. Control is not a one-way street, it can be employed to achieve rapid escalation, as could well be the case once it becomes evident the cessation of bombing is serving no purpose. But at what precise moment this might become the better part of strategy, only the President can say.

Although there have been, since the founding of the United Nations in 1945, too many armed conflicts in the world, there has not been a formal declaration of war by any nation.

As the Congress seeks to assist the President in his efforts to gain the limited objectives that have so often been proclaimed, as we review and study the policies and actions aimed at winning those objectives, let us make sure that we place no undue restraints upon the President or insist on any actions that might hamper his efforts to win the war and win the peace.

DUPLICITY IN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration is certainly amenable to the charge of duplicity in government. This administration, which has shed so many crocodile tears about how it sympathizes with the plight of the aged, and professes to want to do so much for the poor, has been doing more to pauperize the aged and poor in this Nation than any administration in the history of America.

This administration, through its inflationary policies, has destroyed the life savings of the retired people by reducing the purchasing power of their pensions and savings. It has made the poor poorer, and the plight of those living on fixed incomes more severe, by driving up the cost of living so high that their meager income is insufficient to purchase the bare necessities of life. And now this administration continues its attack on the less fortunate by insisting that they be required to pay a tax on the use of telephones.

This is certainly duplicity in government. While giving lipservice on the one hand to the plight of the poor and the aged, the administration, on the other hand, is going to compound that plight by taking from these people part of their meager savings and income through a telephone tax. A telephone tax hits hardest those who can least afford it.

In this day and age telephone service is a necessity. Many people rely on this service to do their shopping, to be informed as to their work, as a means of communication with their children, jobs, schools, and homes; and, in many instances where both parents of a family work, this is the only means of communication between their children and emergency agencies. For many, particularly the aged and less fortunate, it is the only means of contact with law enforcement officials, the fire department, doctors, and hospitals.

If the administration needs this additional revenue to help finance the war in Vietnam, let it obtain it by striking a comparable amount from the foreign aid program. Let some of the other nations, who will benefit from the fight against communism as much as the United States, contribute to this onerous task, instead of placing the burden on the aged and those least able to afford it. I shall oppose the imposition of any telephone tax, and hope that those who are interested in the welfare of the aged, retired, and poor will join me.

INDEPENDENT SURVEYS ON THE POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, very few independent surveys have been made in regard to the poverty program. However, the attached article by Haynes Johnson, taken from the Sunday Star of January 23, 1966, gives a detailed report on the action of the program in Little Creek, Ky., which I am sure the

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

849

ists in supporting the need for preservation of our natural heritage, it is certainly appropriate to reinforce one of the very earliest official projects having such a purpose.

This bill is in effect an extension of the Appalachian Trailway agreement which since 1938 has been a guide for the 13 States through which the trail passes. About one-third of the trail is now on Federal lands. It runs from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Ga.

One of the most beautiful sections of the trail lies in my own 27th Congressional District in New York State. It was here in 1922 that the first section of the trail was opened under the leadership of the late Raymond H. Torrey, a name highly honored in my district. The trail there is partly within the Palisades Interstate Park, itself a majestic treasure of natural American forest land. At that point the Appalachian Trail is at the point closest in its entire length to the New York metropolitan area. Perhaps here the greatest numbers of Americans enjoy this fraction of American in its original condition.

In substance my bill H.R. 12204 provides coordination of the efforts of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Defense and those of other Federal officials in providing uniform administration and protection of the Appalachian Trail. The trail is designated to be a trailway which shall be maintained so as to retain its natural and scenic character. The Secretary of Interior, with concurrence of other Federal agencies, is authorized to issue regulations carrying out the purpose of the act. The Secretary is authorized to redefine the route in order to improve its quality. The bill sets up the principle of locating the trailway to provide maximum retention of natural conditions and scenic and historic features, and its primitive nature. The bill provides for acquisition by the Federal agencies of properties through donations or willing sellers, all for the benefit of the trailway objectives.

PEACE QUEST PRAISED

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the President has made quite clear his hopes for ending the war in Vietnam. No one doubts that the United States prefers peace—a just and honorable peace—to a mean and ugly war. Our motives will go far to convince others that we do not seek added territory and that we do not seek to rob another country of its resources.

A recent editorial in the Washington Star is typical of many which have praised the administration for its approach to ending the war in Vietnam. Because this editorial is of much interest, I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 17, 1966]

CONTINUING PEACE QUEST

Whatever signals have or have not been received from the Communist leaders in Hanoi, President Johnson is acting as if he means business in his search for peace in Vietnam.

The state of the Union message did not, as many people expected, mark the end of a

peace offensive and a return to intensified war. It marked, on the contrary, the culmination of an appeal to shift the conflict from the battlefield to the conference room.

Since then the Russian mission to Hanoi headed by party leader, Alexander N. Shelepin, has wound up its work. Along with increased aid for North Vietnam, the Russians also have been urging negotiations, in the opinion of some analysts here. In South Vietnam, observers have marked a slackening pace of hostilities. In New Delhi where he attended the funeral of Premier Shastri, Vice President HUMPHREY conferred for almost 2 hours with Russian Premier Alexei Kosygin, presumably on ways to end the fighting.

The surprise visit of Secretary of State Rusk to Saigon adds fuel to the speculation that something is cooking. The opposition of the South Vietnamese Government to any formal negotiations at this stage is a major obstacle to peace talks that would have to be overcome if discussions were to be held. The presence of Mr. Rusk in the troubled capital, along with the President's chief emissary, Averell Harriman, suggests that the chances are brightening.

"I am hopeful," said Mr. Johnson Wednesday. "And I will try as best I can with everything I've got to end this battle and return our sons to their desires." The substance of these hopes today remains very much a mystery. But few can doubt that the President is doing his best.

DR. MANFRED GEORGE

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a man who was not only a great American, but a great citizen of the world. The death of Manfred George in New York on December 30 has saddened not only those who knew him, but all those through the world who were familiar with Aufbau, the German language weekly which he edited so brilliantly and tirelessly for more than 25 years.

Manfred George came to this country in 1939. At that time he could already look back on a distinguished career in his native Germany as an author, novelist and, above all, a journalist. Forced to leave Germany because of his implacable enmity to Nazism, he settled briefly in Czechoslovakia, then in France and finally found his way, like so many other refugees from tyranny, to the United States.

Shortly after his arrival he was persuaded to take over a small monthly newsletter, called Aufbau, dedicated to maintaining contact among German speaking refugees. Under his inspired leadership this publication, which soon became a weekly, gained worldwide renown as one of the finest German language papers in the world. Today Aufbau is read in more than 80 countries and is universally respected as a thoughtful and outspoken voice for decency and liberalism.

Through the pages of Aufbau Manfred George provided an entire generation of immigrants with their first link to their new homeland. While international in its interest, Aufbau was and remains primarily an American paper, and through it our many new citizens who arrived in the late thirties and early

forties as refugees from the evils of Hitlerism received their first introduction to America.

Manfred George communicated a sense of excitement, dedication, and the sheer joy of being alive. And he never once lost sight of his aim and his supreme ideal: freedom and decency everywhere. Wherever the fight for human decency was being waged, he was at home: whether it was Germany or Israel, New York or Mississippi. His pen was in the forefront of the struggle against oppression and tyranny. His life was dedicated to the cause of freedom and justice.

Mr. Speaker, all those who shared his ideals have lost an articulate spokesman. Manfred George was not only an illustrious constituent but a cherished friend whose sound counsel I valued. He was fortunate in leaving a monument of his own creation. Aufbau will endure because Manfred George succeeded in imbuing it with his own spirit. Through his paper he will continue to live.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD articles about Dr. Manfred George which were published in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune on January 1, 1966:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1966]
DR. MANFRED GEORGE 72, DIES; EDITOR OF GERMAN WEEKLY HERE—NOVELIST AND BIOGRAPHER MADE AUFBAU A VOICE OF HELP TO REFUGEES OF NAZISM

Dr. Manfred George, editor of Aufbau, a German weekly here, died Thursday night in the University Hospital. He was 72 years old and lived at 785 West End Avenue.

Dr. George, a biographer and novelist, who was known as a liberal editor in Germany before the rise of Hitler, became editor of Aufbau in 1939, after arriving here as a penniless refugee.

Aufbau was then a small monthly newsletter published by the German Jewish Club of New York, which is now the New World Club, Inc. Dr. George marshaled a distinguished advisory board, including Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann, and built the publication into an influential weekly with a circulation of 30,000.

In World War II, the Aufbau helped thousands of refugees adjust to new homes and aided in the reunion of families and friends. It offered subscribers English lessons, information about naturalization, jobs, and housing.

Aufbau changed with the times. Its search column, which assisted refugees in tracing families after the war, gave way to a supplement to help Jews establish claims for restitution from the German Government. Today, it carries theater and opera reviews, columns on the stock market, and hobbies, as well as articles on world affairs.

EXCLUSIVE FROM HEUSS

"Aufbau," Dr. George once said "never stressed the concept of collective guilt for Germany." This resulted in friendly relations with the German Government. In 1951, Theodor Heuss, President of West Germany, gave Aufbau an exclusive story about the decision of his Government to pay Jews for loss of property under Hitler.

Dr. George toiled as many as 100 hours a week, aided by a staff of 30, to get Aufbau to its subscribers throughout the United States and many foreign countries. His reward was a loyal readership among uprooted people all over the world.

He was born in Berlin, the son of a businessman, and studied law at the Universities of Berlin, Greifswald, and Geneva. In World War I, he served in the German

army and was discharged in 1915, after being severely wounded. In 1917, he received a doctor of jurisprudence degree from the University of Berlin.

While a student, he entered journalism. He served for 2 years as managing editor of the weekly *Deutsche Montagszeitung*. In 1917 he joined the Ullstein Verlag, newspaper publishers. He served as local editor of several of its Berlin papers and then became chief editor of the *Berliner Abendpost*.

ESCAPED FIRING SQUAD

Later he went to Silesia as a correspondent and to direct the Ullstein office in Breslau. While reporting on the Upper Silesian plebiscite during the Kapp Putsch of 1920, he was arrested by rightwing insurgents and escaped a firing squad only after producing a certificate of military service.

He left Ullstein in 1923 to join the Mosse Verlag, for whose newspapers he was drama critic and a correspondent. He returned to Ullstein in 1928 as chief editor of *Tempo* and was coeditor of the cultural magazine *Marsyas*.

In the 1920's and early thirties, he wrote political articles for liberal journals, radio dramas, and a musical revue, "Oh, U.S.A.," which had 50 performances in Berlin in 1931.

He also wrote short stories, novels, including "Eine Nacht in Kattowitz," which was seized and destroyed by the Nazis before its scheduled publication, and brief biographies, including one of Marlene Dietrich.

"The Case of Ivar Kreuger," was the title at his study of the Swedish financier, which was translated into English and Italian.

A member of the German Zionist movement, Dr. George wrote an early popular biography of Theodore Herzl, the Zionist leader, with introductions by Mann and Einstein.

LED ANTIHITLER PARTY

With the growth of nazism, Dr. George became an active opponent, serving for several months as president of the Republican party of Germany.

After the Nazis took control in 1933, he went on foot over the mountains into Czechoslovakia and became editor of a Prague newspaper. In 1935, helped found the *Judische Revue*.

He spent 6 months in Spain during the civil war, reporting from the Loyalist side to Czechoslovak, Swiss, Austrian, Dutch, and Rumanian papers.

After the Munich pact of 1938, Dr. George made his way here through Hungary, Yugoslavia, Italy, Switzerland, and France. He started on the *Aufbau* at a salary of \$15 a month.

At the celebration of the publication's 30th anniversary March 21 at the Hunter College Assembly Hall, the speakers included Mayor Wagner; Dr. Heinrich Knappstein who was the West German Ambassador, and diplomatic representatives of Israel and Austria. President Johnson sent greetings.

INTERVIEWED THE FAMOUS

Dr. George wrote thousands of articles for leading European and United States publications and had interviewed, among others the late Dr. Albert Schweitzer, David Ben-Gurion, and Mr. Johnson.

He became a citizen in 1945.

In 1963, West Berlin's Mayor Willy Brandt presented to Dr. George the *Berliner Bar Award*.

He was a member of the Overseas Press Club, the Foreign Press Association, the Jewish Academy of Sciences, B'nai B'rith, and the Zionist Organization of America.

Surviving are his widow, the former Jeanette Simon; a son, Frank D. George; a daughter, Mrs. Renee G. O'Sullivan; and three grandchildren.

There will be a private funeral service.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
Jan. 1, 1966]

MANFRED GEORGE, EDITED GERMAN AUFBAU
HERE

(By Jerome Zukosky)

Manfred George had been swept across the borders of Europe before Nazi oppression, at times crossing mountains on foot, when he arrived penniless in New York in 1938.

A lawyer, prolific author of plays and biographies, a journalist who ranged the world, and a leader of liberal German republican politics, he was one of the tens of thousands of German-Jewish professionals who contributed to the flowering of a liberal and humane German culture before Hitler. It was his mission, Dr. George wrote later, to preserve in America what remained of that tradition.

He succeeded by creating *Aufbau*, or Reconstruction, as a forum for his countrymen. He began at a salary of \$15 a month with a decrepit typewriter, a 1-room Manhattan office and a 4-page monthly newsletter of a refugee's club and 2,000 subscribers. Working often 7 days a week and 14 or more hours a day, writing much of the paper himself, Dr. George turned *Aufbau* into one of the most influential foreign-language newspapers in the United States. Its circulation of about 38,000 a week includes readers in 38 nations.

Dr. George, editor of *Aufbau* for the last 27 years, died Thursday evening at University Hospital of a stroke at 72. He entered the hospital in October after a long illness but continued to edit the paper from his bed, telephoning constantly to his shabby cluttered office at 2121 Broadway, on whose walls were pictures of such old friends as Marlene Dietrich, whose first biography he wrote.

Dr. George rounded up an advisory board in 1941 for *Aufbau* that included Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, Franz Werfel, Lion Feuchtwanger, Emil Ludwig, Freda Kirchwey, Roger N. Baldwin, and others of similar talent who set the tone of the paper. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who occasionally contributed and with whom Dr. George had a long and lengthy correspondence.

Dr. George mixed sophisticated theater reviews—he was one of the first to pay serious attention to the off-Broadway theater—and literary news with advice to the immigrants about finding jobs, apartments, and language instruction. Special sections were devoted to tracing missing persons and survivors of the Nazi holocaust and helping refugees here make claims for restitution from the postwar West German Government.

Yet Dr. George "never stressed the concept of collective guilt for Germany," he said, and his moderation paved the way for close ties with the West German Government. At a testimonial meeting at Hunter College last May on *Aufbau*'s 30th anniversary, some 2,000 readers gave an ovation to West German Ambassador Heinrich Knappstein as well as the Israeli consul general here.

As *Aufbau*'s readers changed into Americans, so did Dr. George and his paper. "When I go to Europe now, I am going abroad," he said in 1959. He felt increasingly cut off the postwar German generation, for which he used the German word "truemmerkinder"—children of the ruins. "They are bent, they came out of the shadows, there is a wall between us," he said.

His paper runs an average of 32 pages a week. Walter Lippmann is translated into German, but Art Buchwald and Dick Schaap of the *Herald Tribune* appear in English.

Dr. George was born in Berlin, the son of a businessman whose ancestors included rabbis, merchants, and architects. His study of law was interrupted by World War I, during which he was seriously wounded in

the German Army. Soon after obtaining his law degree in 1917 he began writing for German newspaper. He was editor of the *Berlin Abendpost*, drama critic for the *Berliner Volkszeitung*, and later Prague correspondent for the *Nationalzeitung* of Basel, Switzerland, which he served as American correspondent after emigrating here.

During the 1950's Dr. George contributed to the *Herald Tribune* editorial page and wrote many articles for other newspapers and magazines in the United States.

Surviving are his wife, the former Jeanette Simon of 785 West End Avenue, a former social worker he married in Germany in 1920; a son Frank, an architect, of Stamford, Conn.; a daughter, Mrs. George O'Sullivan, a book illustrator, and three grandchildren. A private funeral service will be held today. A memorial forest in Israel in honor of Dr. George is being planned.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIENT IN U.S. SHIP CONSTRUCTION

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget released today contains provision for construction of only 13 new merchant ships.

As of October 31, 1965, the U.S.S.R. had 464 merchant ships of 1,000 gross tons or over under construction or on order. The Soviets have reached the point where some 24 percent of the total number of ships being built throughout the world are being built for them.

Shipyards in some of our closest allied nations are hard at work trying to fill the Russians' orders. Britain, Japan, Italy, Holland—they are all building ships for the Reds.

By comparison, the United States had only 39 merchant ships under construction or on order as of last October. Our own shipyards are operating at less than half capacity.

During 1965, the Soviets accepted delivery of 100 new ships, while the United States took delivery of only 16. In terms of cargo capacity our total delivery of ships was approximately 24 percent that of the Russians.

The Soviet Union spent over \$600 million last year on new ship construction. The U.S. figure comes to less than 20 percent of that.

The importance of shipping strength in time of war or national emergency is seen from the fact that our merchant marine has been called our "fourth arm of defense." Yet so pitiful is today's U.S. shipping strength that it has become necessary for the Defense Department to charter foreign ships, at least four of them, for the sealift to Vietnam.

Last week the Chief of Naval Operations raised serious questions about the adequacy of this Nation's shipping strength to handle emergency requirements.

Somewhere in the Defense Department someone has been derelict in assessing the need for shipping capacity in time of emergency.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I urge that a full and thorough review of this matter be initiated immediately. So

ARTHUR PATRICK CANNON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to advise my colleagues and friends of the death of a former Member of this distinguished body, Arthur Patrick Cannon, who represented the Florida counties of Dade and Monroe, and his country extremely well. He died on Sunday, January 23.

He was born in Powder Springs, Cobb County, Ga., on May 22, 1904. The family moved to South Carolina where Pat attended public school and Wofford College at Spartanburg, S.C. Pat Cannon came to Florida where he attended John B. Stetson University at DeLand and then graduated from the University of Miami in 1931 with an LL.B.

Arthur Patrick Cannon served in this distinguished body from January 3, 1939 to January 3, 1947.

"Pat," as he was affectionately called by his many friends, was an able, knowledgeable, and humble man of great heart, who knew and understood—and was ever willing to assist—his fellow man.

In 1939, speaking before a committee of the Congress, he stated:

My walking in marble halls has not caused me to forget thousands of shacks that house many of our unfortunate people, where they merely exist, hungry, ill-clothed, without medical care.

Pat never forgot his fellow man. He was always in the forefront of those striving to better each individual's way of life.

He was among the first to propose and encourage the adoption of Federal old-age assistance programs. He was among the first to propose Federal programs to assist the rehabilitation of veterans—particularly the wounded veteran. He urged that more liberal benefits be included in the Social Security Act.

Pat was a strong supporter of the Florida sugar industry and was an early advocate of the intracoastal waterway, which is now nearing completion.

Pat was a leader among those who proposed programs to eliminate poverty and crime and to increase education and employment opportunities.

In the late thirties, when crime and poverty were most prevalent and when employment was at a low ebb, he told his colleagues in these halls:

It is true that there has been crime in the past and unfortunately in all probability there always will be crime. But it is just as true that idle youth is a dangerous instrumentality. If we turn the crime pages that have blackened our history we will be reminded that "Baby Face" Nelson, "Pretty Boy" Floyd, and John Dillinger all embarked on their criminal careers during the tender years of their lives. I am firmly of the be-

lief that criminals are not born, and that criminals are made, largely by the environment in which they find themselves. A child born of normal parents who are equipped to properly rear the child does not become a criminal. The activity and the anxiety and the ambition of unbridled youth cursed with poverty and denied the association of parentage because of economic conditions is the matter with which we must concern ourselves. Thousands of boys and girls are graduated from our high schools and colleges mentally fit and equipped in every way to fill that niche in society. As they walk out into the world, employment is not found. They are nonetheless ambitious and nonetheless able, and as a result of the deplorable condition of lacking of buying power and lack of available employment, they are called upon to use their good resources toward a criminal end. That is the plight largely of a greater portion of the inmates of our houses of correction, penitentiaries, and reformatories today and likewise our asylums. The youth of America must be employed and put to work and it must be done immediately, lest irreparable injury visit our society.

Pat was a great humanitarian, always concerned with the welfare of his fellow human being, possibly because of his humble beginnings, but whatever the reason, it is certain that Pat was motivated by a keen desire to help the youth, our elder citizens, veterans, and the deserving downtrodden.

After his fruitful and vigorous service in the Congress of the United States, Pat returned to Miami.

He went on to become a circuit judge elected in 1952, 1954, and in 1960 for a 6-year term. He was serving in that office at the time of his death.

Pat Cannon was an outspoken man. No one ever had any doubt about where Pat Cannon stood on anything, because he was quick to tell you.

Pat Cannon will be missed sorely by his friends and colleagues. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that I may have permission to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until 12 o'clock midnight tonight to file a report on the bank merger bill, H.R. 12173.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SEVENTY-SEVEN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE URGE THE PRESIDENT NOT TO GIVE UP CURRENT PEACE OFFENSIVE

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members of the House, sharing a growing concern about the war in Vietnam, last Thursday drafted a letter to the President and in the course of only 4 hours on Friday obtained its signature by 77 Members. Our letter to the President expressed our support of his extensive efforts to move the Vietnamese war to the conference table and we promised him our continued support in resisting aggression against South Vietnam. We urged the President not to give up on his current peace offensive at this time and we offered a suggestion that the United Nations be asked to seek an effective cease-fire in Vietnam.

On Saturday the President replied to our communication in the form of a letter addressed to me as the first name in the alphabetical list of signers. Mr. Speaker, the text of our letter, including a list of all Members who have signed or associated themselves with it, along with the text of the President's reply, is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support the vigorous efforts you have undertaken to bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table. Specifically, we applaud you for the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam and for the extensive personal contacts you have initiated with the leaders of other nations to make clear our unrelenting desire for a just peace. We would like to suggest that you further request the United Nations to seek an effective cease-fire and that we pledge our support and our resources to such an effort.

While the response from the other side has not been encouraging, we do not believe we should yet assume that the door has been firmly closed. We cannot expect that a conflict which has raged so bitterly for so long will be quickly or easily resolved. Neither can we ignore the alternative to negotiations, a prolonged and probably expanded war with attendant costs in human suffering and material resources.

We staunchly support the determination of our Government to resist the terror and aggression which deny the people of South Vietnam the right freely to determine their own future. We continue to support you in that commitment. We recognize that there are those who urge a resumption of bombings of North Vietnam and a premature abandonment of our peace efforts. We are, however, concerned that unless we can halt or reverse the escalation of the last months



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1966

No. 9

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this Scripture: *My son, give me thine heart and let thine eyes observe my ways.*

Our Heavenly Father, we humbly turn to Thee for Thou art the source of the life that is eternal, of the light that never fails, and the love that never forgets.

As we bow together, the cares of life become less burdensome and its struggles less difficult.

Grant that we may always have a great trust in Thee, and take counsel with Thy will and purpose as we give ourselves to each task and responsibility.

Let us not live on the low level of our temptations and yield to those trials and tribulations, which we daily encounter, and seek to drag us down.

Lift us to the wider outlook of that quiet place of vision and service and may we serve Thy holy will faithfully and reverently.

In the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 21, 1966, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to ex-

empt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3126. An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIRLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYNINGS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10779) entitled "An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. METCALF, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MONTAYA, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. MURPHY to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to attend the meetings to be held in Washington, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, on February 9 through 16, 1966.

BOARD OF VISITORS, AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. LAIRD, and Mr. DOLE.

BOARD OF VISITORS, COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Sr. ONGE and Mr. WYATT.

BOARD OF VISITORS, MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CAREY and Mr. MAILLIARD.

BOARD OF VISITORS, MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LIPSCOMB, and Mr. PIRNIE.

BOARD OF VISITORS, NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. KING of New York.

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

845

it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a further pause, a ceasefire and meaningful negotiations. We urge you, therefore, to continue your present determined search for peace until such time as it becomes clear that no reasonable hope remains for a just settlement by peaceful means.

Sincerely yours,

BROCK ADAMS, JOSEPH ADDABBO, THOMAS ASHLEY, JONATHAN BINGHAM, JOHN BLATNIK, JOHN BRADENAS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JAMES BYRNE, RONALD B. CAMERON, JEFFREY COHELAN.

JAMES CORMAN, WINFIELD DENTON, JOHN DOW, KEN DYAL, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD FRASER, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, RICHARD FULTON, ROBERT GIAMMO.

JACOB GILBERT, JOHN GILLIGAN, HENRY GONZALEZ, BENNARD GRABOWSKI, GEORGE W. GRIDER, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, HARLAN HAGAN, WILLIAM HATHAWAY, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER.

FLOYD HICKS, CHET HOLIFIELD, ELMER HOLLAND, HAROLD JOHNSON, JAMES KEE, PAUL KREBS, ROBERT LEGGETT, CLARENCE LONG, RODNEY LOVE.

RICHARD MCCARTHY, HARRIS McDOWELL, JR., JAMES MACKAY, JOHN MACKIE, RAY MADDEN, LLOYD MEEDS, GEORGE P. MILLER, WILLIAM MOOREHEAD, JOHN MOSS, LUCIEN NEDZI.

BARRATT O'HARA, JAMES O'HARA, ALEC OLSON, JOHN RACE, ROLLAND REDLIN, THOMAS REES, HENRY REUSS, GEORGE RHODES, EDWARD ROYBAL, WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

JAMES SCHEUER, B. F. SISK, HERBERT TENZER, PAUL TODD, JR., JOHN TUNNEY, MORRIS UDALL, WESTON VIVIAN, CHARLES WELTNER, LESTER WOLFF, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., ANDREW JACOBS, JR., BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD P. BOLAND, JOSEPH E. KARTH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1966.

Hon. BROCK ADAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am responding to you as the first in alphabetical order of those Members of the House who have written to me under date of January 21 on the search for peace in Vietnam. I hope you will share this answer with your cosigners.

I am grateful for your strong support of our effort to move the war in Vietnam to the conference table. This support is a real encouragement, coupled as it is with the equally strong support of our determination to meet our commitments in Vietnam.

I share your interest in effective action through the United Nations, and I want you to know that there is no part of this whole problem to which we give closer attention. I have reviewed this matter many times with Ambassador Goldberg, and we have repeatedly considered the suggestion you offer. You can be assured that he and I are firmly determined to make every possible use of the United Nations in moving toward peace, and toward an effective cease-fire as part of that purpose.

Unfortunately, you are correct in your statement that the response from the other side has not been encouraging. The evidence available to this Government indicates only continuing hostility and aggressiveness in Hanoi and an insistence on the abandonment of South Vietnam to Communist takeover. We are making no hasty assumptions of any sort, but it is quite another matter to close our eyes to the heavy weight of evidence which has accumulated during the last month.

I can give you categorical assurance that there will be no abandonment of our peace efforts. Even though it is increasingly clear that we have had only a hostile response to the present pause in bombing North Viet-

nam, you can be sure that our unflagging pursuit of peace will continue. As I said this week in a letter to Speaker McCormack, "Whether the present effort is successful or not, our purpose of peace will be constant; we will continue to press on every door."

And at the same time, I am confident that as elected representatives of the American people, you will share my determination that our fighting forces in Vietnam shall be sustained and supported "by every dollar and every gun and every decision" that they must have "whatever the cost and whatever the challenge." For a month we have held our hand in an important area of military action. But the infiltration of the aggressor's forces has continued, and so have his attacks on our allies and on our own men. I am sure you will agree that we have a heavy obligation not to add lightly to the dangers our troops must face. We must give them the support they need in fulfillment of the commitment so accurately stated in your letter—"the determination of our Government to resist the terror and aggression which deny the people of South Vietnam the right freely to determine their own future."

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN TAX CREDIT PROVISION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE U.S. ECONOMY

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These sections provide that if a U.S. corporation owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign or first level corporation, and if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of a second level or a foreign subsidiary, the domestic parent corporation may credit its proportionate share of the subsidiary's taxes. No credit is allowed to the U.S. corporation for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation beyond the second level.

As an example, a U.S. corporation has a wholly owned or majority owned foreign subsidiary in country X. This subsidiary wishes to develop a new activity in which local capital should participate, but it is in no position to provide 50 percent of the required capital without help from its American parent. However, it could provide 25 percent, with local capital providing the other 75 percent. Under present tax law, the latter cannot be done without complete loss of foreign tax credits on the new enterprise.

The foreign tax credit provision of the Internal Revenue Act, which was enacted in 1918 to remove international double taxation, has been amended several times. The present requirements of 10 percent and 50 percent ownership go back to the 1951 tax law. I understand that the 1951 requirement of at least a 50-percent stock ownership on the second level was predicated entirely on administrative convenience to the Internal Revenue Service. However, section 6046 of the Internal Revenue Code now requires an information return from each U.S. person who, directly or indirectly,

owns 5 percent or more in the value of the stock of a foreign corporation. In addition, the 1962 tax law dealing with "subpart F income" provides the Treasury with detailed information on foreign operations of U.S. taxpayers. All this information in the hands of the Internal Revenue Service should eliminate the administrative inconvenience which might arise from reduction of the ownership test from 50 percent to 25 percent and from inclusion of the third level foreign corporation in the tax credit structure.

The proposed amendment would reduce the 50 percent requirement to 25 percent between the first and second levels and would include third level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25 percent test is met.

This change will have four major effects, all of which are in our national interest:

First. It will contribute to the U.S. balance of payments.

Second. It will enable American business to expand and grow abroad with reduced amounts of American equity capital.

Third. It will create a more favorable business climate abroad by furthering the increased participation of foreign local nationals in their own foreign economy.

Fourth. It should encourage a demand, wherever feasible, for raw materials, products and equipment to be supplied from sources within the United States rather than elsewhere, thereby benefiting our economy through increased employment and income.

Income from oversea investments by U.S. industry is the major factor in the U.S. balance of payments. Consequently, anything that can be done to expand the source of this income, without the use of U.S. dollars, would further the balance-of-payments' position. Such expansion also is affected by foreign competition which requires American industry operating abroad to protect its marketing position by additional investment from either the United States or abroad.

The United States has taken certain steps to reduce the amount of U.S. dollars used for foreign investments. One way to expand and grow without using U.S. dollars is to encourage foreign nationals to share in the ownership of the foreign enterprises in which American industry has interests. The reduction of the 50-percent test to 25 percent, and an extension of the credit to third level foreign corporations, would enable American industry, without the loss of foreign tax credits, to tap local sources of capital in the foreign country in which modernization and expansion are required to meet foreign competition abroad.

In addition, the increased participation of foreign nationals with American business in the industrial life of a particular foreign country should create a healthier attitude toward American activities in that country. Section 106(1a) of the Canadian Income Tax Act, effective in 1963, is an example of the concern of foreign governments for increased

local participation in non-resident-owned businesses. This law provided for a reduction in the Canadian withholding tax paid by nonresident corporations having a prescribed degree of Canadian ownership.

In those countries which have local national stock exchanges, use of local equity capital could lead to a wider distribution of the stock of a second or third level foreign corporation. This penetration of the local capital markets could create additional sources for raising future venture capital.

Modernization and expansion of American financed industry abroad are necessary to meet foreign competition abroad. Under the foreign tax credit structure, as it now exists, capital required for such modernization and expansion must come largely from the United States. This is so because any reduction of the 50-percent stock interest between the first and second level foreign corporations, or the use of third level foreign corporations, would result in a loss of foreign tax credits to the U.S. parent corporation.

As this proposed legislation will prove beneficial to the economy of the United States as well as participating foreign countries, I urge my colleagues to actively support its enactment.

THE 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues know, I am for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 394, is not new—it has been in the hearts and on the minds of men since the days of that great American, James Madison, who favored a longer tenure of office for Members of the House.

Many others, over the years, have fought for this worthwhile project. In my own case—it has taken the constant prodding of my people for 20 years to arouse me to do something about it. Only when I had to fight and finance four, hard, costly campaigns, all in the last 2 years, would I launch myself into the frontline trench of the 4-year term battle. I refuse to sit idly by and wait until election costs grow so great and so frequent that only a wealthy person with unlimited means can afford to run for Congress.

The President has one version of this legislation and I have another. While our approaches differ somewhat, we both want a 4-year term. President Johnson may be on the New York Central and I on the Pennsylvania but we will arrive at the same destination. Only the route, the modus operandi, or legislative mechanics are at variance. I shall gratefully accept constructive amendments to my bill. I am happy to introduce today the President's prepared draft of the legislation.

I am convinced that the people of the United States are for this constitutional

change by a ratio of 3 to 1. The Gallup poll—a 3-to-1 count—which was released last week, is in keeping with the many polls that have been taken by various Members of the House in their respective congressional districts.

For a year now, many of you have good naturedly needled me for "more action" on this legislation. At the lunch counter, at the dining room table, on the floor, behind the rail, in the cloakroom, on the train between buildings, you have "kidded" me to "get with it." Now that you have action and a powerful friend and ally, I would admonish you to quit talking and go to work on our 41 colleagues who are against the legislation and those 67 others who have expressed some doubt. Surely, the 254 who are strong for the measure here in the House do not need any persuasive conversation.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am, and have been, an advocate of the 4-year term for Members of the House. The increasing burdens of the office, the expense of campaigns, the ability through modern communication to keep close contact with his people, the need for undivided attention to the national problems are all persuasive.

However, Mr. Speaker, even as I applaud the support of the administration for this idea I am critical of the proposal as advocated by the administration.

First, I feel that there should be an expression by the electorate on national issues every 2 years; a staggering of the terms would accomplish this goal.

Second, I see no reason to insert in the necessary constitutional amendment a limitation which would prevent a Member of the House from running for the Senate unless his term had expired or unless he resigns. Surely such a provision is not necessary to induce these statesmen who serve in the other body to vote for such an amendment.

I am unalterably opposed to cluttering up a constitutional amendment with such a limitation. I hasten to add I am not and probably never will be a candidate for the Senate.

ERRONEOUS STORY ABOUT SUMMER POST OFFICE JOB

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I should like, this morning, to pay my respects to the Washington Post.

On September 14, 1965, the Washington Post said I had got a summer post office job for one of my relatives. Never doubt that the Washington Post prints the news. It was news to me, especially since it was not true.

Well, they were pretty nice about it.

They ran a correction containing a regret.

But I must confess that when, on January 22, 1966, the Washington Post reran the same erroneous story about the same alleged job for the same alleged relative, it did get to be a bit of a bore.

Besides, some of my relatives are beginning to find out and complain about the job discrimination.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF PUERTO RICO

(Mr. POLANCO-ABREU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, poverty has always been the number one enemy of Puerto Rico. Twenty years ago, in order to destroy this foe, Puerto Rico embarked upon an industrial development program with the object of raising living standards for all its people and particularly for its working people in the cities and in the fields. Its interest was and is in the educational and economic opportunities for the poor.

But in industrializing, Puerto Rico's policy was and is to create new industrial activity and to build on that base. Through these years, Puerto Rico's spokesmen have made it clear—and I emphasize this again today—that Puerto Rico neither seeks nor will shelter runaway industries from any State.

We seek only a small share of the annual expansion of U.S. industrial capital. Mainland expansion of manufacturing capital in recent years has been about 4 percent per year, adding 1,200,000 jobs annually. Puerto Rico has been developing at the rate of about 29,000 jobs per year, or about 1 for every 40 in the mainland.

I make these observations because there was raised in the record of this forum the question of minimum wages in Puerto Rico with the suggestion that Puerto Rico might be enticing industries from the mainland. The implication was that minimum wages in Puerto Rico are too low and that Puerto Rico is thus placed in a position of competitive advantage with the mainland firms.

Mr. Speaker, the implication is false, and I maintain that it is unnecessarily damaging to the 2.4 million fellow citizens living and working in the island.

Puerto Rico will not build on the foundation of misery for its people. We belong to the family of governments which advocates and strives for better things for its people—more jobs, higher wages, more education, better living, fuller employment. We have come far in this respect, and in 1964 had advanced to \$900 per capita income as compared to \$1,749 per capita income in Alabama. Yes, we have come far by the standards of many nations in this hemisphere and in others, but we are still very poor in this respect as compared with any of the sister States of the Union.

The real key to progress is fullest possible employment. Such a condition makes for simultaneous advance on all fronts. When employment rates fall, any community begins to disintegrate